A

GRAMMAR

Literary OF THE Society

PERSIAN LANGUAGE;

of COMPRISING A PORTION OF Bombay.

THE ELEMENTS OF

ARABIC INFLEXION;

TOGETHER WITH

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE STRUCTURE OF EITHER LANGUAGE, CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRINCIPLES OF

GENERAL GRAMMAR.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOLUME SECOND.

BY M. LUMSDEN, LL. D.

PROFESSOR OF ARABIC AND PERSIAN IN THE COLLEGE OF FORT WILLIAM IN BENGAL.

پیش از ین گفته اند اهل سلف
عذر من صنّف قد استهدف

CALCUTTA:

PRINTED BY T. WATLEY, AT THE HONORABLE COMPANY'S PRESS.

1810.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME SECOND.

	Page.
INTRODUCTORY Chapter,	1
Of Particles,	29
Plan of the Syntax,	52
Compoſition and diviſion of Sentences,	56
Of perſonal Pronouns,	64
Conjunctive perſonal Pronouns,	66
Disjunctive perſonal Pronouns,	75
Reciprocal Pronouns,	78
Demonſtrative Nouns,	80
The Relative Pronoun,	89
Interrogative Pronouns,	107
Noun of time and place,	122
Generic Nouns (including the uſe of Articles,)	130
Proper Names,	145
Nouns of Number,	146
Collective Nouns,	ib.
Kenayaut,	147
Aſwaut,	148
Itbaa,	149
Subject and Predicate,	ib.
Fael or Agent to an Active or Neuter Verb,	168
Nominative to a Verb in the Paſſive Voice,	184
Object of an Active and Tranſitive Verb,	189
Univerſal object,	207
Vocative,	209
Haul or Noun employed to deſcribe the ſtate of the agent or object of a Verb,	212

Tumeez

PAGE.

Tumeez or Noun of Discrimination, - - 223

Corroboration, - - - - - 227

Exchange of one word for another, - - 229

The relation of the Genetive Case, - - 231

Substantive Nouns accompainied by Attributives of any kind, - - - - - - 254

Noun of Superiority, - - - - 274

Of the Verbal character, - - - - 282

Imperfect Verbs, - - - - - 293

Perfect Verbs, - - - 300

Application of Tenses, - - 301

The Imperative Mode, - - 314

The Prohibitive, - - 315

General Principle, - - 343

On Verbs considered as Active or Neuter, - - 356

On the interchange of Persons, - - - 360

Occasional omission of Persian Verbs, - - - 364

The relation existing between the ماضی and the امر 367

Of Particles, - - - - 372

Of the significance of certain Letters of the Alphabet, 387

Of Persian Particles and other Words comprising more than one letter. } 424

N. B. The account of these Particles extends to the end of the Volume, and as they are treated in the order of alphabetical arrangement, any one of them may be easily discovered by the reader.

O F S Y N T A X.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

I PROPOSE, in this Chapter, to offer a few obſervations on the nature of the parts of ſpeech, as defined in the writings of Eaſtern Grammarians. The definitions to which I allude, differ, in many eſſential points, from theſe of the correſponding parts of ſpeech, as commonly defined by the Grammarians of Europe: but it cannot be unimportant to inveſtigate the opinions generally entertained by others on this ſubject; and when theſe are fully known, it will then be in the power of every reader, to adopt or reject them according to the dictates of his own judgment.

THE Perſian Grammarians recogniſe three parts of ſpeech, termed اِسْم, فِعْل and حَرْف or NOUN, VERB, and PARTICLE. The term فِعْل comprifes only the TENSES of A VERB, with the IMPERATIVE MODE; and the NOUNS, PONOUNS, ADJECTIVES, PARTICIPLES, ADVERBS, INFINITIVES, and ſeveral ſeeming PREPOSITIONS, are invariably aſſigned to the claſs of nouns. Under the term حَرْف or PARTICLE, are compriſed MOST PREPOSITIONS; ALL CONJUNCTIONS; ALL TERMINATIONS which are not ſignificant in their own right; and alſo certain ARTICLES; ſuch as ال in the Arabic or A, and THE, in the Engliſh Language. To theſe have been added (whether accurately or not) the ſubſtantive verb است *Is*; together with the vowel كَسْر, and

the letter نون , which are ſaid (as we ſhall ſee in the ſequel) to be ſometimes uſed in the ſenſe of the ſubſtantive verb.

The term فعل or VERB, is defined to be *a word uſed to denote a certain idea, having a neceſſary or eſſential reference to paſt, preſent, or future time*; in oppoſition to the word اسم or NOUN; which is ſaid to denote *a certain idea, having no eſſential, though it may have an accidental reference to paſt, preſent, or future time.* The term حرف or PARTICLE, is ſaid to denote *a certain idea as it exiſts in ſome one or more words with which the particle muſt be therefore connected in a ſentence.* Or, to expreſs the ſame ſentiment in another way, the particle is ſuppoſed *to be dependent, for the ſignificance of its character, on certain other words with which it muſt be therefore invariably connected.* The definition of the particle will be conſidered hereafter; and we now proceed to conſider the definitions of the verb, and of the noun.

It appears, from theſe definitions, that time is an eſſential characteriſtic of the verb; or in other words, that a verb is the only part of ſpeech, that muſt, neceſſarily and invariably, denote a certain idea, having a reference to paſt, preſent, or future time. It alſo appears that time is not an eſſential characteriſtic of the noun; or in other words, that there is not, in any language, a ſingle claſs of nouns (as the infinitive or the participles for examples) that muſt, neceſſarily and invariably, denote a certain idea, having a reference to paſt, preſent, or future time.

It muſt not, however, be inferred, that every individual noun is utterly incapable of marking time, becauſe time is not an eſſential characteriſtic of the noun; for, on the contrary, there is no doubt that time is *accidental* to many nouns; as the infinitive, in the Latin Language; and many participles in various tongues; and hence it is obvious, that the queſtion to be conſidered, is not whether time be or be not inferred from a given infinitive, or a

given

given participle; but whether time be eſſential, and not accidental, to a verb on the one hand; and whether it be accidental, and not eſſential, to every ſpecies of nouns on the other hand.

In other words, we are to conſider, what is eſſentially neceſſary to both; and we are not to encumber the diſcuſſion by enquiring into the accidents of either; becauſe it is obvious, that what is *accidental* to a word can never be *eſſential* to it, and conſequently that a noun, a verb, or a particle, would continue to maintain its place among the parts of ſpeech, though all its accidents were taken away.

That time is eſſential to every verb is a propoſition that muſt be admitted if the terms فعل and verb, ſhall be underſtood to convey the ſame idea; for as the term فعل has already been defined to be a word uſed to denote a certain idea, having a neceſſary or eſſential reference to paſt, preſent, or future time; ſo, it follows, that this term will ceaſe to be applicable to every word, which cannot be accurately compriſed under the terms of the definition. On the other hand, every word, (of whatever ſpecies) to which time is truly eſſential, may be accurately compriſed under the term فعل; for if it correſpond, in its nature, with the preceding definition of that term, there can be no good reaſon for withholding an appellation, to which, in that caſe, it will be juſtly entitled.

I shall therefore employ the term فعل in the ſenſe which has now been given to that term; uſing the Engliſh word verb, by way of diſtinction, in its common acceptation: and having aſſumed the poſition, that time is eſſential to every فعل, I ſhall then proceed to conſider, *firſt*, what ſpecies of words may be accurately compriſed under the term فعل; and, *ſecondly*, whether that term be accurately applicable to certain nouns, (ſuch as the infinitive or the participles for example) which have been commonly

monly

monly ſuppoſed to denote a certain idea, having a neceſſary or eſſential reference to paſt, preſent, or future time.*

THAT time is eſſential to the various *tenſes* of every verb, is a propoſition that cannot be denied; ſince it is time alone, that conſtitutes a tenſe; and, conſequently, if time be abſtracted from any given tenſe of any given verb, ſuch tenſe may ſtill continue to retain its character as a verb, according to our idea of that term; but its character as a tenſe will be entirely deſtroyed. To explain by an example. The word LOVETH is the preſent tenſe of a verb: it may be reſolved into IS LOVING: it denotes AN ATTRIBUTE, TIME, and AN ASSERTION. But if aſſertion alone

* THE reader is ſuppoſed to be acquainted with the nature of ATTRIBUTIVES (of which the verb is one ſpecies), as explained by Mr. HARRIS. The reaſoning of Mr. HARRIS, ſo far as it is neceſſary to notice it here, is intended to demonſtrate, *firſt*, that every *verb* denotes *an attribute, time, and an aſſertion*; *ſecondly*, that every *participle* denotes *an attribute*, in conjunction with *time*; and, *finally*, that every *adjective* denotes *an attribute*, without reference to time. It follows therefore, according to his theory, that ASSERTION is an eſſential characteriſtic of the verb; and that TIME is an eſſential characteriſtic of the participle; becauſe there is nothing but time and aſſertion, to diſtinguiſh theſe from other parts of ſpeech. It alſo follows, that no word can be a verb, which implies no *aſſertion*; and that no word can be a participle, which implies no reference to *time*; becauſe the terms VERB or PARTICIPLE, as applicable to any given word, neceſſarily imply the exiſtence, in that word, of every thing which is eſſential to the one or the other. But if it be eſſential to every verb to denote an *attribute, time*, and *an aſſertion*; then muſt all theſe circumſtances concur to conſtitute a verb; and the abſence of any one will deſtroy the verb, though the other two may continue to be preſent. For *aſſertion* is termed an eſſential characteriſtic of the verb, becauſe it is the only circumſtance, by which a verb can be eaſily diſtinguiſhed from other parts of ſpeech; but it does not follow, that there is nothing eſſential to the verb, but aſſertion alone. On the contrary, the circumſtances of *time*, and of *the attribute*, may be not leſs eſſential to verbs, than aſſertion itſelf; but if it be true, that ALL theſe circumſtances are equally eſſential to verbs, and that aſſertion is eſſential to verbs alone, then does aſſertion conſtitute a better characteriſtic of the verb than time, or the attribute; which are ſuppoſed to be eſſential, not only to verbs, but to participles alſo. But ASSERTION alone has been ſuppoſed by ſome writers to be ſufficient to conſtitute a verb, without reference to the circumſtances of TIME or the ATTRIBUTE; which are thought, by theſe writers, to be accidental, and not eſſential, to that part of ſpeech. (SEE ENCYCLOPŒDIA BRITANNICA ARTICLE GRAMMAR.) I ſhall therefore, leave the reader to the exerciſe of his own judgment, on the queſtion, whether or not a ſimple aſſertion be ſufficient to conſtitute a verb; obſerving, only, that if it be ſufficient for that purpoſe, a ſimple verb has nothing to do with tenſes, ſince aſſertion, abſtracted from time, is the ſame in every tenſe; and that it has nothing to do with an infinitive or imperative mode, ſince neither of theſe modes denote aſſertion.

be essential to a verb, it will continue to be a verb, though the circumstance of time were taken away; and if time be essential to a tense, it must cease to be a tense, as soon as it shall cease to denote past, present, or future time.

It may be inferred, therefore, THAT THE TENSES OF EVERY VERB ARE ACCURATELY COMPRISED UNDER THE TERM فِعْل; and the IMPERATIVE MODE may be included under the same term with equal accuracy; *first*, because it denotes a command; and *secondly*, because every command must, by its own nature, imply a reference to present or future time, since it cannot be referred to past time, without an obvious absurdity*.

It remains to be considered, whether time be essential to any of those parts of speech which are included, by Eastern Grammarians, under the term اِسْم or NOUN; but as INFINITIVES and PARTICIPLES are the only species of nouns, to which time can be considered as essential on any principle, it will be sufficient to endeavour to prove that time is not essential, but only accidental, to every infinitive, and every participle; and, in the event of my suc-

* Whatever may be true at all times, can have no essential, though it may have an accidental reference, to a given time: but AN ASSERTION may be true at all times, as "The whole is greater than a part:" or "The whole is equal to all its parts:" An assertion, therefore, has no essential, though it may have an accidental reference to a given time; that is to say, it has no essential reference to past, to present, or to future time. And whatever cannot be referred to all times, must have an essential reference to a given time: but A COMMAND cannot be referred to all times; that is to say, it cannot be referred to that portion of time which elapsed before it was uttered. Every command must, therefore, have an essential reference to that portion of time which is to succeed its utterance; that is to say, it must have an essential reference to present, or future time.

Before I put an end to this note, I think it necessary to state, that *tense* or *time* is not in my opinion, *essential*, but only *accidental* to every verb. The reasons on which my opinion is founded, will be fully detailed in the course of this chapter; and, in the mean time, I shall only observe, *first*, that the term فِعْل is intended, by the Eastern Grammarians, to be applicable only to verbs; *secondly*, that their definition of that term, which is copied into the text, describes merely the nature of a tense; *thirdly*, that there are tenses of the infinitive and the participles, as well as tenses of the verb; *fourthly*, that these tenses are *accidental*, but not *essential*, to any one of the parts of speech; and, *finally*, that the definition of the term فِعْل which has been copied into the text, is therefore not less accurately applicable to the tenses of an infinitive or a participle, than it is to the tenses of the verb itself.

cess, it will not be contended, that time is essential to any other species of nouns.

The infinitive is not inflected in the Arabic and Persian languages, as it is in the Latin, and other tongues; and the Arabs have not even distinguished, by any alteration in the form of the word, the infinitive in the active, from that in the passive voice; so that ضَرْب may signify *Beating*, or *Being beaten*; (that is, *to beat*, or *to be beaten*;) قَتْل *Slaying*, or *Being slain*; &c. just as the English words *slaying*, or *slaughter*, have the same double sense in the two following examples:—"The slaying or slaughter of "these innocent men was a crime of the greatest magnitude." "The slaying or slaughter (on the side) of the enemy was very great."*

It is probable, therefore, that the Arabian Grammarians know nothing of those inflexions of the infinitive which are termed its *tenses* in Latin Grammar: such as AMARE, *To love*; AMAVISSE, *To have loved*; AMATURUM ESSE, *To be about to love*; and as they have only PAST AND PRESENT PARTICIPLES (or, to speak more accurately, ACTIVE AND PASSIVE PARTICIPLES), they are equally ignorant, in all probability, of the nature of that noun, which is termed THE FUTURE PARTICIPLE; as MORITURUS, *About to die*; RECTURUS, *About to rule*; REGENDUS, *About to be ruled*; and others of the same description.

* I believe the infinitive of the active voice often acquires a passive sense in every language; as in the case of PETER PINDAR's Razor Grinder, who states that his Razors were made *to sell*; that is to say, that they were made *to be sold*. So also the verb دیدن *To see*, acquires a passive sense in the following example from the خوان خیال.

برای دیدن ایزد آفریدش   وگرخود را ندیدان کس کو دیدش

"GOD created him *to be seen*; and he who has once seen him, loses (in the contemplation "of his beauty) all knowledge of himself."

The Arabic however is the only language, so far as I know, in which there is no distinction of form, peculiar to the infinitive in the passive voice; and hence it may be inferred, that the infinitive, in that language, (and I suppose in every other) denotes simply *the name of an event*.

BUT

But every INFINITIVE, and every PARTICIPLE, must comprise in itself all that is essential to an infinitive or a participle; and the difference between two infinitives, or two participles, or two modifications of the same infinitive, constitutes properly the accidents of each. If it can be proved therefore, that time is not essential to the infinitive, it will be of no consequence that a given infinitive such as AMARE, or AMAVISSE, or AMATURUM ESSE, does, in fact, denote past, present, or future time; and so, also, if time be not essential to a participle, its accidental occurrence in the participles MORIENS, MORTUUS, and MORITURUS, will be of no importance.

Now the infinitive has already been defined to be THE NAME OF AN EVENT; with or without reference to its *occurrence*, but without the least reference to the *time of its occurrence*; and it is admitted by all the late Grammarians, that the infinitive, like other names, is merely an abstract substantive noun; since there is no difference between LOVE, LOVING, and TO LOVE; DEATH, DYING, and TO DIE; &c. as we have already seen.* It follows, therefore, that the simple infinitive, stript of its accidents, has no reference to time any more than those abstract substantive nouns with which it corresponds; and accordingly, the simple infinitive, like the name of a substance, may become the subject of a general proposition, in which it has not the least

* There is always that distinction between THE INFINITIVE and THE ISMÉ MUSDER, which I have already explained on a former occasion; but every infinitive may be used in the sense of an Ismé Musder; and every Ismé Musder may be used in the sense of an infinitive properly so called; or, in other words, both may be used as abstract substantive nouns, to denote merely *the name of an event, without reference to its occurrence*; or both may be used as infinitives, to denote *the occurrence of the event with reference to that relation which exists between it, and a given substantive noun, which would be the nominative or agent to the tenses of the verb.* Thus the infinitive TO DIE is used as an ISMÉ MUSDER, in the following example from SPENCER, as quoted by Mr. HARRIS.

For not, to have been dipt in Lethe lake,
Could save the son of THETIS from TO DIE.

And, on the other hand, the substantive DEATH is used as an infinitive properly so called, whenever it is connected with that substantive noun, which would be the nominative or agent to the tenses of the verb; as *my death*, or *his death*, *&c.*

reference to time; as when we say, "To die, is common to all men;" "Iron is the most useful of all the metals.*"

On the other hand, EVENTS of every species have a [illegible] and obvious capacity to assume the accident of time; be[illegible] have not, like a substance, any permanent existence in [illegible] and are often, on the contrary, so exceedingly transitory, that we have barely time to perceive their occurrence, before they are snatched from our view; as in the *flashing of lightning* for example; the commencement, duration, and completion of which, are divided by points of time infinitely too small to be obvious to the senses, although they may doubtless enter into the conception of the mind.†

It is easy to conceive, ~~therefore, that every~~ event, with reference to its fleeting and transitory nature, may be accurately typified in language by three or more substantive nouns or names; the first being the name of *the present event*; the second being the name of *the past event*; and the third being the name of *the future event*; or the name of the event considered with reference to its future occurrence. Accordingly, certain events, such as that signified by the word DAY, for example, are so typified in every language; as when we say TO-DAY, YESTERDAY, and TO-MORROW; and the difference existing between these three substantive nouns, is precisely of the same nature, with that which exists between the three inflexions of a Latin infinitive.

THE Latin infinitive does therefore mark PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE TIME; as the words TO-DAY, YESTERDAY, and

---

* If the infinitive TO DIE, were used to denote present time, the assertion in the text would be absolutely false; for all men are not NOW dying; that is to say, to die, in time present, is not common to all men.

† Every event must have *a beginning*; and, consequently, may have *an end*. Every event, therefore, must be contemplated by our minds in a transitory point of view; though I grant it to be true, that any given event, as *love*, *hatred*, or *esteem*, being once begun, may be conceived, by the mind, to endure for ever.

TO-

TO-MORROW, mark paſt, preſent and future time; but time is not eſſential to the infinitive, any more than it is to other ſubſtantive nouns; becauſe an infinitive, ſtript of its accidents, is merely the name of an event; with or without reference to its occurrence; but without the leaſt reference to the *time* of its occurrence; and the accidents of the infinitive are theſe; that it may be the name of A PRESENT, A PAST, OR A FUTURE EVENT.*

I NOW proceed to conſider the nature of PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE PARTICIPLES, Active and Paſſive.

THE اسم فاعل or ACTIVE PARTICIPLE, is defined to be THAT ADJECTIVE WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO THE TRUE AGENT OR NOMINATIVE TO A VERB;† and the اسم مفعول or PASSIVE PARTICIPLE, is defined to be THAT ADJECTIVE WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO ITS TRUE OBJECT; or, in other words, to the ſubſtantive noun which is expoſed to the action of the verb. Thus, if I beat another man, I am the ضارب, that is, *the*

---

* If the obſervations in the text be founded in truth, it follows, *firſt*, that the infinitive, in all its inflexions, is merely an abſtract ſubſtantive noun or name; and, *ſecondly*, that the inflexions of an infinitive might be not leſs numerous than the tenſes of the verb which is derived from it; ſince the ſame reaſon that leads us to invent three different names for *a preſent*, *a paſt*, and *a future event*, might ſuggeſt to us a variety of other names for the ſame event, conſidered as *imperfect*, *preterperfect*, *pluperfect*, *&c.* That all the inflexions of an infinitive are ſimple ſubſtantive nouns or names is a propoſition that will be confirmed, I imagine, by the uſage of every tongue; and that the Latin infinitive, with its three inflexions, repreſents *five tenſes*, I collect from the ETON Grammar of the Latin language; in which AMARE is ſtated to repreſent two tenſes; namely, the preſent and the preterimperfect, and AMAVISSE to repreſent two more tenſes; namely, the preterperfect and the preterpluperfect of the infinitive mode. The third inflexion, namely AMATURUM ESSE, repreſents, of courſe, the future tenſe.

† It ought to be obſerved, that the definition in the text is common to ſimple adjective nouns, as well as to active participles; ſince the word حسن *Beautiful*, which is a ſimple adjective, is doubtleſs applicable to that ſubſtantive noun which is the nominative or agent of the verb حسن يحسن *He was, or is beautiful*, &c. And, in point of fact, the difference between a ſimple adjective, and an active participle, conſiſts merely in this; that though both are applicable to the ſame ſubſtantive noun, namely, to that noun which is the nominative or agent to the tenſes of the verb, yet the one denotes *the exiſtence*, and the other, *the occurrence* of the attribute, in every noun to which it is imputed. (See Note, page 390).

beating man, or *the beater*; and if I am beaten by him, I am the مضروب, that is, *the perſon beaten*.*

BUT the ſubſtantive is commonly omitted, after many Arabic and Perſian adjectives, for reaſons formerly ſtated; (See page 157 et ſeq.;) and hence, the participles are termed اسم فاعل or NAME OF THE AGENT; and اسم مفعول or *name of the object*, becauſe, the ſubſtantive being omitted, the participle commonly ſupplies its place. Examples: عاشق *A loving man*, or *A lover*; معشوق *A perſon loved*, or *A miſtreſs*; خادم *A ſerving man*, or *A ſervant*; مخدوم *A perſon ſerved*, or *A maſter*; عابد *A worſhipper*, or *devotee*; معبود *A being who is worſhipped*, or *A* GOD; كاتب *A writing man*, or *A writer*; مكتوب *A thing written*, or *A letter*; حاكم *A ruling man*, or *A ruler*; محكوم *A perſon ruled*, or *ſubjected to the command of another*; &c.

---

* Leſt the reader ſhould miſtake the meaning of the word *object*, as it is here uſed, I think it neceſſary to ſtate, that it is meant to include all thoſe nouns to which a verb is tranſitive, whether with or without a prepoſition; and to exclude all thoſe nouns to which a verb is not tranſitive, though theſe may poſſibly follow the verb in the accuſative caſe. If it be affirmed, for example, that *James ſtruck John*; or that *James ſpoke to John*; it is obvious that the action of the verbs *To ſtrike*, and *To ſpeak*, are equally tranſitive to the ſubſtantive *John*, in either caſe: and thus the introduction of the prepoſition *to* after the verb *ſpoke*, beſtows an *active and tranſitive character* on that neuter verb. But if it be affirmed on the other hand, that *James ſtruck a blow*, or that *John fought a battle*, the words *blow* and *battle*, though properly put into the accuſative caſe, are not expoſed to the action of the verbs *To ſtrike* and *To fight*; and hence it follows, that they are not the *objects* of theſe verbs, in the ſenſe in which the term *object* is now uſed. To ſay *James ſtruck a blow*, or *John fought a battle*, is, indeed, preciſely the ſame thing as if we ſaid, *James ſtruck*; or *John fought*; for the words *blow* and *battle*, being ſynonimous with the words *ſtriking* and *fighting*, denote, merely, *the ſenſe of the infinitive of the verb which precedes them*. Such accuſatives (were it conſiſtent with the idiom of our language) might be common to all verbs, without exception, whether active, paſſive, or neuter; as *Drinking a drink*; or *Walking a walk*; or *Riding a ride*; or *Dying a death*; or *Sleeping a ſleep*; or *Dreaming a dream*, &c. That it is, in fact, extended to moſt verbs in the Arabic Language, is well known to every Arabic Scholar; and hence it is termed by Grammarians مفعول مطلق, or the *univerſal object*; being that object, which is applicable to all verbs in the Arabic Language without exception. The object of a tranſitive verb is termed, on the contrary, مفعول به.

And

And ſo, alſo, in the Perſian Language; as نویسنده *A writing man*, or *A writer*; نوشته *A thing written*, or *A letter*; گوینده *A ſpeaking man*, or *A ſpeaker*; گفته *A thing ſpoken*, or *A ſpeech*, &c.

It follows, therefore, from this definition, that time is not eſſential to either of the participles; becauſe a participle, ſtript of its accidents, is merely that adjective which is applicable to the agent or the object of a verb.

But as every verb denotes the occurrence of an event, ſo every event, having no eternal or permanent exiſtence in nature, muſt, of neceſſity, occur in paſt, preſent, or future time; and hence, it is eaſy to conceive, that three or more participles or attributives, may be accurately aſcribed to the agent or the object of every verb; the firſt, or preſent attributive, being applicable when the event is actually preſent or going on; the ſecond, or paſt attributive, when the event is paſt; that is, when it has exiſted at ſome preceding period of time, whether it exiſt at preſent or not; and the third, or future attributive, when the period of its exiſtence is near at hand.

This I conceive to be a true account of the preſent, the paſt, and the future participles, active, paſſive, and neuter; as MORIENS *Dying*; MORTUUS *Dead*; and MORITURUS *About to die*; &c. and hence it follows, *firſt*, that every participle is active, which is applicable to the true agent or nominative to a verb; *ſecondly*, that every participle is paſſive, which is applicable to the true object or ſufferer; *thirdly*, that a paſſive participle cannot be accurately derived from any other than a tranſitive verb; and, *finally*, that many paſſive participles are improperly conſidered, in our language, as active participles of the paſt tenſe.

That a paſſive participle cannot be derived from any other

than

than a tranſitive verb muſt be ſufficiently obvious; ſince verbs of every other ſpecies, having no object to which they are tranſitive, are of courſe defective in that adjective, of which the characteriſtic is, that it ſhall be applicable to the object of a tranſitive verb. Accordingly, the paſſive participle is never derived from any Arabic verb which does not alſo poſſeſs the paſſive voice; and the ſame thing muſt be true in every language, becauſe it is founded in reaſon, and the nature of things. *

IT remains to be ſhewn that many paſſive participles are improperly conſidered, in our language, as active participles of the paſt tenſe.

THE difference between two or more participles, derived from a neuter verb, or from the ſame voice of an active or a paſſive verb, muſt conſiſt in time alone; becauſe ſuch participles, however numerous, will be ſucceſſively applicable, at different times, to the ſame object: as in the caſe of MORIENS *Dying*; MORTUUS *Dead*; and MORITURUS *About to die*; which are obviouſly deſcriptive of the ſame individual (namely, the nominative to the verb *Morior*) with reference to the preſent, the paſt, or the future occurrence of his death. Theſe, therefore, are accurately claſſed together under the terms preſent, paſt, and future participles; becauſe there is nothing but time to diſtinguiſh one from another.

BUT the active and paſſive participles, as *Loving* and *Loved*; *Knowing* and *Known*; *Giving* and *Given*; *Seeing* and *Seen*; &c, cannot poſſibly be applicable at different times to the ſame object; becauſe the diſtinction between them does not conſiſt in this, that one denotes preſent, and another paſt time; (for, on the contrary, both are ſimple participles implying no reference to time;

* It is to be obſerved, however, that many neuter verbs become active or tranſitive, when followed by certain prepoſitions; as *James ſpoke to John*; *The Hounds run down the Hare*; *The Birds flew through the air*. &c. &c. In this caſe, the paſſive participle, like the paſſive voice, may doubtleſs be accurately derived from ſuch verbs.

or both are participles of the present tense, implying a reference to present time;) but in this, that one is applicable to the agent and another to the object of the verb; or, in other words, that one is an اسم فاعل or PARTICIPLE OF THE ACTIVE VOICE; and the other, an اسم مفعول or PARTICIPLE OF THE PASSIVE VOICE.

SUPPOSE, for example, that I *know*, or *am acquainted with*, a certain occurrence; it is obvious that this, to me, is *a known occurrence;* and that I am the person *knowing the occurrence;* or, in other words, that the participle *knowing* is that adjective, which is applicable to *me*, who am the nominative or agent of the verb *To know;* and that the participle *known* is that adjective, which is applicable to the word *occurrence* the true object of the same verb. Nor is it possible to conceive any instance, in which the simple or uncompounded participle *known* will be accurately applicable to the true agent or nominative of the verb *To know;* or any instance, in which the participle *knowing*, will be accurately applicable to the true object of that verb.

IT is obvious, therefore, that the participles *Knowing* and *Known*, *Loving* and *Loved*, *Giving* and *Given*, *Seeing* and *Seen*, *&c.* are distinguished, from each other, as active and passive participles; and that the passive participles *Loved*, *Known*, *Given*, *Seen*, and others of the same description, can never be accurately considered (although they are so considered in every English grammar which I have seen) as active participles of the past tense *.

BUT

* IN our Language, the active participle of the past tense, when formed from an active or transitive verb, is invariably compounded of the passive participle and the word *having*, as *having loved; having known, having seen, &c.* Now, it must be obvious, that this compounded participle is invariably applicable to the *agent*, and never to the *object* of the verb; since we affirm of the same individual, that he is at present *writing*, or has already *written a letter;* meaning, in the one case, that he is the person *writing* the letter; and, in the other case, that he is the person *having written it;* or the person who *wrote it*. But, if the word *having* be taken away, the second component part, namely *written*, will be invariably applicable to the *object*, and never to the *agent* of the verb; (or, in other words, it will be

applicable

But many grammarians are of opinion, that the active participle, as *Loving*, invariably denotes *preſent time*; and that the paſſive participle, as *Loved*, invariable denotes *paſt time*; whereas, in point of fact, there can be little doubt that both are *ſimple participles*, implying no reference to time; or that both are participles of the preſent tenſe, implying a reference to preſent time.

The active participle has been ſaid to denote preſent time, becauſe it invariably repreſents the action of the verb as *preſent* or *going on*, with reference to a certain period of time; as in the following examples, *I am writing now; I was writing yeſterday; I will be writing tomorrow*; in which the action ſignified by the verb *To write*, is ſtated to be ſucceſſively repreſented as preſent or going on, with reference to that period of paſt, preſent, or future time, which is expreſſed by the various tenſes of the ſubſtantive verb. So, alſo, the paſſive, or as it is termed, the paſt participle, is ſaid to denote paſt time on the ſame principle; *namely*, becauſe it invariably repreſents the action of the verb as finiſhed or completed, and conſequently paſt, with reference to a certain period of paſt, preſent, or future time; as in the following example, AMATUS FUERO *I ſhall have been loved*; in which the participle AMATUS is ſaid to denote paſt time with reference to the word FUERO; becauſe, when that future time, expreſſed in the word FUERO, ſhall come to be preſent, the action contained in the participle AMATUS will then be finiſhed or completed, and conſequently paſt. (ſee Encyclopœdia Britannica, Article Grammar).

Now the completion or termination of an action is doubtleſs inferred from many paſſive participles; for if we ſpeak of *a written letter*, or *a fortified town*, the hearer knows that the letter

applicable to the *letter*, and not to the *writer*;) and muſt therefore be invariably a paſſive participle; and not, an active participle of the paſt tenſe. The Perſian participle in هاى مختفى is uſed in both ſenſes; as, كشته *Having ſlain*, or *The perſon ſlain*; ديده *Having ſeen*, or *The object ſeen* نوشته *Having written*, or *a thing written*, &c.

alluded

alluded to is already finished; and that the projected fortifications have been brought to an end. For as a letter is never completely written, while any part of it remains to be done, so it follows, that a *written letter* is an expression exactly synonimous with a *letter which has been written or finished;* and not with a letter *which we now write;* or *which we are now writing;* and hence it may be inferred, with the utmost accuracy, that the passive participle *written* does in fact denote past time, in one sense of the term; *first,* because it denotes an action already finished; and *secondly,* because every action which is finished, is necessarily past.

But if we substitute the participle *Loved,* for the participle *written,* the same inference cannot be drawn; for *a beloved friend,* (and so also of *a revered friend, a detested foe,* and other similar examples,) is an expression exactly synonimous with *a friend whom we love;* and cannot, by any fair construction, be understood to signify *a friend whom we did love,* or *will love,* at any past or future period of time. It is obvious, therefore, that the passive participle *Loved* does not imply the completion or termination of the action signified by the verb *To love;* and that the hearer naturally infers from that participle *the present,* and not *the past* or *future operation* of the sentiment *Love,* on our minds. And as the existence of past time, in the passive participle, cannot be otherwise proved, than by means of that inference, by which every passive participle is supposed to denote an action already *completed* or *finished,* and consequently *past;* so that inference being founded in error, (since it is not true of every passive participle, though it is true of many) it follows that there is no proof that passive participles do essentially, or of necessity, though it is granted that many of them, (from the nature of their signification,) may accidentally denote past time.

The following appears to be the principle, on which many passive participles, such as *written, fortified, built, &c.* denote

an action already finished, and consequently past; while other passive participles, such as *Loved, Esteemed, Revered, &c.* denote an action not yet finished, and therefore still present or going on.

Certain actions of the transitive class, such as *Love, Hatred,* or *Esteem,* may continue for ever, to be transitive to the same object; since the progress of these actions, as applicable to any given object, does not necessarily lead to their extinction or termination at any definite or indefinite period of time. Accordingly a man may continue to love his friend, or hate his foe, with equal or encreasing vehemence, during the whole course of his life; and if his present existence were to endure for ever, the same thing would be true, so long as the nature of these events shall remain unchanged. There are other actions of the transitive class, such as *writing, reading, building, painting, &c.* which cannot be eternally applicable to the same object; for if we undertake *to write a letter,* or *to build a house,* it is obvious that every step of our progress, in the performance of such actions, is necessarily one step towards their completion or termination.

Now if the passive participle be derived from an action which may continue for ever to be transitive to the same object, the termination or extinction of that action will not be inferred from the passive participle; for if that inference were accurate, in such cases, we might continue for ever, to love our friends, or hate our foes, without being able to assert with truth, at any one period of time, that we reckoned among our acquaintances, a beloved friend, or a detested foe. Accordingly, the termination of such actions is never inferred from the passive participle, (because their completion and termination are not by any means synonimous terms;) and must be invariably expressed in positive or implied terms; as when we speak of a friend *formerly* beloved; a foe *formerly* detested; &c.

On the other hand, every passive participle, derived from a finite action, does necessarily denote the completion or termination of that action; for as the passive participle has already been defined to be that adjective which is applicable to the true object of a transitive verb, or, in other words, to the substantive noun which is exposed to the action of the verb; so, if the action be finite by its own nature, no substantive noun can be completely, though it may be partially, exposed to its action, at any period of time preceding that in which the action is completely finished or concluded. Accordingly, *a written letter* means *a letter already finished;* and if the participle written be ascribed to an unfinished letter, it must be modified by the introduction of some word significant of that circumstance; as a letter *partly* written; a house *partly* built; a town *partly* fortified; &c.

But though every action which is finished, is necessarily past; and though many passive participles, such as *written, built, painted,* &c. denote an action already finished; there is much reason to believe, that all these are *simple* passive participles implying no reference to time; or that all are participles of the present tense, implying a reference to *present* time. For an action which is finished, and consequently *past*, in one sense of the term, may yet be considered as *present*, in another sense of the term; and it is perfectly obvious, that many finite actions are so considered in every language; as when we speak of a *surrounded army*; a *blockaded port*; and other similar examples.

For the action signified by the verb *To surround*, is completely finished, and consequently past, as soon as an army *surrounded* is completely encompassed; but we continue to affirm, in *the present tense of the verb*, that " one army *surrounds* another," not only during the whole of that period of time which is employed in the performance or completion of the action signified by the verb *To surround*; but also, during the whole of that subsequent period of time, which may elapse after an army is

completely ſurrounded, and before it is enabled to extricate itſelf.

It is obvious, therefore, (ſince it cannot be maintained, that the *preſent* tenſe of the verb denotes *paſt* time) that the *relative poſition of the two armies*, as well as the action ſignified by the verb *To ſurround*, is often aſſigned to paſt, preſent, or future time, by the various tenſes of that verb; and on this principle, it may be affirmed that the paſſive participle *ſurrounded* (if it imply any reference to time) is a participle of the preſent tenſe, implying a reference to *preſent time*; ſince it denotes, in the preceding example, (namely, *a ſurrounded army*,) the preſence of that relative poſition of the two armies, to which I have now adverted.

On the ſame principle, the paſſive participle *written*, (or any other paſſive participle of the ſame claſs) may be alſo conſidered as a participle of the preſent tenſe; ſince there is no inconſiſtency in ſuppoſing the action ſignified by the verb *To write*, (any more than the action ſignified by the verb *To ſurround*) to be preſent in its effects, at any given period of time, ſubſequent to that in which the action ſignified by that verb, or, in other words, *the act of writing*, has been completely finiſhed or concluded. In this caſe, *a written paper* means a paper in which the action ſignified by the verb *To write* is preſent in its effects, though the act of writing may have been long ago paſt; and thus, if we muſt maintain the exiſtence of time in the paſſive participle, I cannot perceive any principle, on which the paſt can be accurately preferred to the preſent time.

But it is impoſſible to prove the exiſtence of time in the preſent participle active (Loving,) or the preſent participle paſſive (Loved,) or the preſent tenſe of the infinitive, (To love or To be loved,) by any argument which may not be alſo uſed to prove the exiſtence of time in a ſimple adjective noun; and I am therefore diſpoſed to believe, that theſe are ſimple infinitives,

and

and ſimple participles; having not the leaſt reference to time. For the preſent exiſtence of an attribute, in a given object or ſubſtantive noun, will be naturally inferred from a ſimple adjective (as in the caſe of *a good man*; or a *beautiful woman*,) unleſs we are informed of the contrary, by the introduction of ſome word intended to rectify our ideas on that ſubject, (as a woman *formerly* beautiful, or a man *once* good) and in this reſpect, there is not the leaſt difference between a ſimple adjective, and thoſe active or paſſive participles to which I have now adverted.

And ſo, alſo, the infinitive in the preſent tenſe, or, to ſpeak more accurately, the ſimple infinitive, denotes merely the occurrence of a certain event; leaving the period of its occurrence, with reference to paſt, preſent, or future time, entirely undefined. And this is the reaſon why the infinitive in the preſent tenſe (that is to ſay, the ſimple infinitive) may accurately coaleſce with every tenſe of the ſubſtantive verb; as when we ſay "To die is and was and will be common to all men," whereas the infinitive in the paſt tenſe (being the name of a paſt event) cannot coaleſce with the ſubſtantive verb in the preſent tenſe; ſince it is not true that all men *have died*; or, in other words, that "To have died," or "To be now dead," is an event common to all men. And as it is equally untrue that all men *are now dying*; or, in other words, that death, dying, or to die, in time preſent, is an event common to all men; ſo, if the infinitive *To die* did in reality imply any reference to preſent time, the phraſe "To die is common to all men," would contain an aſſertion abſolutely falſe; but the aſſertion on the contrary is ſtrictly true; and this ſeems to me to be a convincing proof that the ſimple infinitive has no reference, or at the moſt, an *occaſional* reference to preſent time.

It appears from the preceding obſervations, *firſt*, that the term may be defined to be a word ſignificant of a certain idea having a neceſſary or eſſential reference to paſt, preſent, or future

time;

time; *ſecondly*, that the term اِسْم may be defined to ſignify a word denoting a certain idea, which has no eſſential, though it may have an accidental reference to paſt, preſent, or future time; *thirdly*, that the various tenſes of a verb, and the imperative mode, are accurately compriſed under the term فِعْل; and, *finally*, that the infinitive and the participles are properly aſſigned to the claſs of nouns; ſince time is not eſſential to either of theſe parts of ſpeech, though it may be accidental to both.

But though I have been hitherto guided by the Perſian Grammarians, in defining the term فِعْل to be a word uſed to denote a certain idea, having a neceſſary or eſſential reference to paſt, preſent, or future time; I am clearly of opinion, that time is accidental, and not eſſential, to every verb; and, conſequently, that the definition of the term فِعْل conveys a very imperfect, and even erroneous idea, of the true nature of the term VERB. For though I am not certain that there is any ſuch thing to be found in any language as a ſimple verb ſtript of its accidents, I have not the leaſt doubt that time is accidental, and not eſſential, to every verb; or, in other words, that the verbal character would be unimpaired though circumſtance of time were taken away. And though time were eſſential, and not accidental to every verb, the preceding definition would ſtill convey an imperfect idea of that term; *firſt*, becauſe it defines merely the nature of a tenſe, to which time muſt be eſſential, and not accidental, ſince time is that which conſtitutes a tenſe, or that, without which, no tenſe can have any exiſtence; and *ſecondly*, becauſe there are tenſes of the infinitive and the participles, as well as tenſes of the verb; from which it follows, that the preceding definition, being equally applicable to the one or the other, muſt be inſufficient to determine the difference between them.

The following obſervations will convey to the reader a juſt idea of the true nature of verbs, and other words, whether primitive or derivative, according to the beſt of my judgment.

If language be considered on principles of reason, without regard to the particular structure of any given tongue, it must be admitted, that substantive nouns furnish the true and proper materials, from which verbs, adjectives, and participles, are necessarily derived. For the verbs, adjectives, and participles, of every tongue, denote merely the various modifications, of which a certain substantive is naturally susceptible; that is to say, they represent the sense of a substantive, modified by the addition of some other circumstance, by which it is converted, into a participle, a verb, or an adjective noun. And as the accuracy of this principle is entirely independent on the particular structure of any given language, so it is eqully true, whether the substantive be the primitive, as in the case of *vice* and *vicious;* or the derivative, as in the case of *good, goodness*; *great, greatness;* and other examples of the same nature. For *great* and *vicious*, equally denote the existence of *greatness* and *vice*, in a given object or substantive noun; and though the one be a primitive, and the other a derivative adjective, yet neither would be intelligible, unless the sense of the corresponding substantive were preconceived by the mind.

It is obvious, therefore, that substantive nouns furnish the true and proper materials of language; without which, verbs, adjectives, and participles, can have no existence; and though it may be true, that there is not, in a given language, a corresponding substantive, for every participle, verb, and adjective noun, it may yet be affirmed, with certain accuracy, that there ought to be so; *first*, because all verbs are *attributive*, as will be shewn hereafter; and *secondly*, because no attributive can be intelligible, unless the sense of the corresponding substantive, which is comprised in it, be first understood.

Substantive nouns are divided into those which do, or do not, denote the name of a substance; that is to say, of some class of external or material objects whether animate or not; and most of the substantive nouns in every language, which do not

denote the name of a ſubſtantive, muſt denote the name of an event; becauſe there are very few objects in nature, to which it is poſſible to aſſign a name, that may not be accurately compriſed under one or other of theſe terms.

But the name of a ſubſtance is not naturally the ſource of derivation; or to ſpeak more accurately, the relative and the diminutive are the only ſpecies of nouns, with which it has a natural and obvious connexion; and, accordingly, the relative, as بَغّال *A muleteer;* سَنْگِين *Of ſtone;* &c. or the diminutive, as مَرْدَك *A little man;* اَسْپَك *A little horſe;* &c. are the only ſpecies of nouns, that are commonly derived from the name of a ſubſtance. But the name of a ſubſtance may become, in time, the name of *an event;* as in the caſe of the word *ſaddle,* when we ſay of an individual that *he ſaddled his horſe;* and, in this caſe, the name of a ſubſtance becomes, like other events, the prolific ſource of *verbs, adjectives, participles,* and other derivatives of every ſpecies *.

For I have already had occaſion to remark, that every event may be typified, in language, by a great variety of ſubſtantive nouns or *names;* each noun denoting the name of the event, with reference to ſome particular diviſion or ſubdiviſion of paſt, preſent, or future time. And hence it follows, that every tenſe of any given verb might have a correſponding tenſe or inflexion of the infinitive mode; or, in other words, that the greateſt poſſible number of both, which might belong to a given verb, is exactly the ſame.

But every inflexion of the infinitive mode may be conſidered,

* The name of a ſubſtance may often become the name of an event in every language; as *To paper a room; To ſaddle a horſe; To ink the paper;* &c. And, on the other hand, the name of an event may often become the name of a ſubſtance; as in the caſe of the word *feed,* when we ſpeak of *a feed of corn;* that is to ſay, that quantity of corn, which a horſe uſually conſumes at one time.

by the mind, in either of two points of view; that is to ſay, it may be uſed as an abſtract ſubſtantive noun, to denote, merely, *the name of the event*; without the leaſt reference to that relation which exiſts between it, and a given ſubſtantive noun which would be *the nominative* or *agent* to the tenſes of the verb; or, it may be uſed as *an infinitive properly ſo called*, to denote the act of ſome one or more agents; in which caſe, it muſt be accompanied (like the tenſes of the verb) by the noun or nouns which mark the names of theſe agents. Thus *giving*, in the abſtract, is a ſimple ſubſtantive noun or name; but *giving*, conſidered as the act of an individual, conveys an imperfect idea, which muſt be accompanied by the name of *the giver*, and of *the gift*, and of *the perſon to whom it is given*, before it can be employed as the *ſubject* of a given propoſition. Now this is the diſtinction, ſo often noticed by the Arabian Grammarians, between *the infinitive* and *the Iſmé Muſder*; and as it is equally applicable to the infinitive, in every inflexion, ſo, it follows, that the number of *Muſders* and of *Iſmé Muſders*, which might belong to a given verb, is exactly the ſame.

FROM the infinitive is derived, *firſt*, the ACTIVE PARTICIPLE, which denotes the OCCURRENCE of the infinitive in a given object or ſubſtantive noun; as when we ſpeak of "a man *daring* to commit a certain crime; &c." *ſecondly*, the SIMPLE ADJECTIVE which denotes the EXISTENCE of the infinitive in a given object or ſubſtantive noun; as when we ſpeak of *a daring* or *an intrepid man*; *a loving* or *an affectionate child*; *&c. thirdly*, the PASSIVE PARTICIPLE, which denotes the TRANSITION of the infinitive to a given object or ſubſtantive noun; as when we ſpeak of *a written letter*; *a blockaded port*; or *a fortified town*; *&c. fourthly*, the VERB IN ITS SIMPLE STATE, by which we PREDICATE or AFFIRM the ſenſe of the infinitive to EXIST, or OCCUR in a given object or ſubſtantive noun; as when we ſay of the Deity, that HE LIVETH FOR EVER, &c. and, *finally*, the verb in the *imperative* and *precative modes*; by which we *command* or *deſire*, that the ſenſe of the infinitive *ſhall exiſt* or *occur* in a given object or ſubſtantive noun; as when we ſay,

Be

Be thou virtuous; Pardon our ſins; Forgive our tranſgreſſions; and other examples of that nature.*

It follows, therefore, if theſe definitions be founded in truth, that ſimple verbs are merely one ſpecies of *attributives*; differing from ſimple participles active and paſſive, juſt as the latter differ from each other; and as both differ from an adjective noun. For it is common to them all to aſcribe the ſenſe of the infinitive to a given object or ſubſtantive noun; and the eſſential difference between them conſiſts, merely, in the manner in which the aſcription is made, as already explained in the preceding paragraph.

On the other hand, the accidents of all are nearly the ſame; for if we except the diſtinctions of *caſe*, which is peculiar to nouns; and the diſtinctions of *mode* which is peculiar to verbs; there is not, perhaps, any one accident of a noun, that might not belong to verbs alſo; or any one accident of a verb, that might not be aſſumed by adjective nouns. For if mode be thrown out of the account, the other accidents of the verb conſiſt in Gender, as ضَرَبَ *He ſtruck*, ضَرَبَتْ *She ſtruck*; in Number, as ضَرَبَ *He ſtruck*, ضَرَبُوا *They ſtruck*; in Perſon, as ضَرَبْنَا *We ſtruck*, ضَرَبْتُمْ *You ſtruck*; in Tenſe, as ضَرَبْتُ *I ſtruck*, أَضْرِبُ *I do* or *will ſtrike*; and in their capacity to aſſume *the degrees of compariſon*; an accident which it is well known, that they have actually aſſumed in the Shanſcrit Language, where the degrees of beating (*I ſtruck more* or *moſt*) can be expreſſed by certain inflexions of the verb, which have been invented for that purpoſe.

* I am unable to conceive, in what ſenſe the term aſſertion is uſed by thoſe Grammarians who maintain that the imperative mode denotes aſſertion; for if every aſſertion muſt, by its very nature, be partly or wholly *true* or *falſe*; it follows, that the imperative denotes no aſſertion; ſince we cannot affirm the truth or falſhood of any ſentence, which is formed by the aid of a verb in the imperative mode.

Now

Now these accidents, with the exception of tense and person, are known to be common to adjective nouns; and if we multiply, in idea, the inflexions of any given adjective, as *good* for example, we shall then have *three inflexions*, applicable to *the first*, *the second*, and *the third persons*; and *three more inflexions*, applicable to past, present, and future time. It is obvious, therefore, (since the principle is the same in every case) that the accidents of a verb, a participle, an adjective, and an infinitive, are, or might be, nearly the same.

But though it be essential to every verb, to predicate or affirm *the existence*, or *the occurrence* of its infinitive in a given object or substantive noun, it may possibly be thought, that the substantive verb *Is*, often denotes the existence, not of its own but of another infinitive, in the substantive noun to which it is imputed. For if it be affirmed of an individual that *he is wise or virtuous*, it is not *being* or *existence*, but *wisdom* or *virtue*, which we mean to ascribe to the substantive noun. And, in this case, the substantive verb seems to be used as a simple connective, or mark of predication; that is to say, it seems to have lost the attribute character, which I conceive to be essential to every verb.

It is to be observed, however, that the verb *To be* has two senses in the infinitive, as well as two senses in the tenses of the verb; for it signifies *existence*, when used as a perfect verb; (*To be* or *To exist*) and it denotes *the name of that connexion which exists between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition*, when followed by an attributive in the infinitive mode: as *To be good*; *To be virtuous*; *To be wise*; *To be worthy*; *&c.* According to this last sense of the verb *To be*, it may, I conceive, be accurately affirmed, that the word *is*, in the preceding examples, predicates the existence of its own infinitive in a given object or substantive noun; but the infinitive itself being merely the name of a certain connection, which cannot be understood unless the extreme terms of the proposition, that is to say, *the subject* and *the predicate*, be

 also

alſo known; ſo the word *is*, which affims the exiſtence of this connexion, muſt be alſo accompanied by both terms.

Or it may poſſibly be true that the verb *To be*, when uſed as a mark of predication or connexion, has loſt the attributive character, which is eſſential to verbs; for when a given word denotes, in its original acceptation, a conjunction of two or more ideas, which might be repreſented by two or more words, it is a common operation of the mind, to deprive that word of a part of the compounded ſenſe which it was formed to denote; and to employ it in the ſenſe of the other part. And hence the word اِقْتَبَسَ (and there are many ſimilar examples in the Arabic Language) may be ſaid to have loſt, in its common acceptation, the ſenſe of its primitive قَبَس *A piece of fire*, or *a ray of light*; and to ſignify merely, چیدن *To gather*, inſtead of نورچیدن *To gather light* or *fire*, which is the literal ſenſe *.

Now every infinitive, when uſed in its proper ſenſe, denotes a conjuction of two or more ideas, which may be commonly expreſſed by an attributive and a mark of connexion; as *Wiſdom* or *Being wiſe*; *Folly* or *Being fooliſh*; *Vice* or *Being vicious*; *&c.* and the ſenſe of the ſubſtantive verb itſelf, when uſed to ſignify *exiſtence*; *(To be* or *To exiſt)* may doubtleſs be rendered by the ſame mark of connexion, followed by the adjective *extant*; as *To be* or *To be extant*; *To be* or *To be exiſtent*; *&c.* It is obvious, therefore, that the preſence or the abſence of the idea, ſignified by the adjective *extant*, determines the double ſenſe of the ſubſtantive verb; and if it be granted, that this idea is compriſed in the literal and genuine ſenſe of that verb, it may yet be contended, that it forms only a component part of the whole ſenſe, and may be conſequently baniſhed from our thoughts, as often as

* If the literal ſenſe were kept in remembrance, we ſhould never ſee ſuch expreſſions as the following; اِقْتَبَسَ نُور *To gather light*; becauſe the uſe of the word نُور muſt, in that caſe, be wholly ſuperfluous.

occaſion requires, according to the principle which I have ſtated. With regard to the principle itſelf, I conceive its operation might be illuſtrated by numerous examples in every tongue; and I am not, therefore, diſpoſed to think that the uſe of the ſubſtantive verb, as a mark of connexion, furniſhes any important argument againſt the admiſſion of the principle which I have endeavoured to eſtabliſh; namely, that a verb, including the imperative mode, may be defined to be a word which affirms or commands the exiſtence or the occurrence of its infinitive, in a given object or ſubſtantive noun.

I NOW proceed to offer a few obſervations on the nature of ADVERBS; which are merely one ſpecies of adjective nouns. When we affirm of an individual, that *He reads well*, or *dances ill*, it is preciſely the ſame thing, as if we aſcribed the adjectives *good* and *bad* to his *reading* and *dancing*; and ſo, alſo, if we ſay of a woman, that ſhe is *uncommonly beautiful* or *remarkably handſome*, it is exactly the ſame thing, as if we imputed the adjectives *uncommon* or *remarkable*, to her *beauty* or her *fine ſhape*. But *fine ſhape* and *beauty* are the ſubſtantive nouns, of which the ſenſe is compriſed in the correſponding adjectives *handſome* and *beautiful*; and ſo, alſo, *reading* and *dancing* are the ſubſtantive nouns of which the ſenſe is compriſed in every tenſe of the verbs *to read* or *to dance*. It is obvious, therefore, that all adverbs modify the ſenſe of that ſubſtantive noun, which is compriſed in a given attributive to which they are imputed; whether this laſt be a participle, a verb, or an adjective noun; and as there can be no reaſon, but that of idiom, why a ſimple adjective ſhould not be employed for the ſame purpoſe, ſo it need excite no ſurpriſe, that adjectives are ſo employed in the Perſian tongue. Examples: اورا سخت زده بودم *I beat him ſeverely*; مطلبش نیک دریافتم *I underſtood his meaning well*; مرد سخت کوش *A man who labors hard*; مرد بدگوی *An evil ſpeaker*; &c.

IN all theſe examples, the ſenſe of a given attributive is modified

dified by a simple adjective noun; and consequently the adjective performs, in each example, the office of an adverb properly so called. So also, the Arabs very often employ a simple adjective noun for the same purpose, as ضَرَبْتُهُ شَدِيدًا *I beat him severely*; for ضَرَبْتُهُ ضَرْبًا شَدِيدًا *I beat him a severe beating*; &c. And as the substantive *beating*, when expressed in the sentence, must be necessarily put into objective case; (ضَرْبًا) so, the Arabic adjective شَدِيد, or any other adjective that may be used adverbially, must be also put into the same case. (شَدِيدًا)

But the sense of an adjective may be often expressed by the cases of the corresponding substantive noun; since there is no difference, in point of sense, between *a wise man*, and *a man of wisdom*; *a virtuous man*, and *a man of virtue*; *a learned man*, and *a man of learning*; &c. And as adverbs are one species of adjective nouns, so, the use of these may be also superceded by the cases of the corresponding substantive noun; whether these cases be formed by the means of inflexion, as اِجْمَالًا *In substance*; تَفْصِيلًا *In detail*; دَفْعَةً *At once*; بَغْتَةً *Suddenly*; اَلْبَتَّةَ *Certainly*; &c. or by the use of prepositions; as فِي الْحَالِ *Immediately*; فِي الْجُمْلَةِ *In short*, or *In substance*; فِي الْفَوْرِ *In haste*; فِي الْوَاقِعِ *In truth*, or *In fact*; بِالْكُلِّ *Wholly*; بِالْيَقِينِ *With certainty*; &c. So, also, the use of an adverb may be occasionally superceded by a compound epithet; or other attributive of any kind; as عَدُوِّ شَدِيدُ الْعَدَاوَت *A bitter enemy*; or *A man bitter in his enmity*; اَسْپِ تيز رَو *A swift going horse*; مملکت روز افزون *An empire encreasing daily*; مَن هر وقت بياد آن مهربان *I who am continually thinking of you my friend*; &c.

In short, the various modes in which the sense of a given attributive may be accurately modified in the Persian Language are very numerous; and as I am not able to form a comprehensive and perspicuous arrangement of these, I shall only observe,

on this ſubject, *firſt*, that there are very few words in the Perſian Language which can be excluſively aſſigned to the claſs of adverbs, ſince almoſt every ſeeming adverb will be found to be a real adjective or a ſubſtantive noun; and, *ſecondly*, that the Grammarians of Arabia and Perſia, as it might be expected in theſe circumſtances, have not recogniſed the exiſtence of adverbs, for which they have no correſponding term in either language.

OF PARTICLES.

I NOW proceed to conſider the nature of PARTICLES, and to ſtate the reaſons which induce me to believe in the exiſtence of this very queſtionable part of ſpeech. A particle, that is to ſay a prepoſition or a conjunction, (and as I conceive, a termination alſo) has been defined by Mr. HARRIS, to be "a word devoid of all "ſignification; but ſo formed as to unite two or more ſignificant "words, which refuſe to coaleſce or unite of themſelves." Now it is not true, that particles are devoid of all ſignification; for if it were true, they would be utterly uſeleſs to the expreſſion of our thoughts; *firſt*, becauſe an inſignificant word can ſignify nothing; that is to ſay, it can be of no uſe in the expreſſion of our thoughts; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe there can be no difference, in point of ſenſe, between two inſignificant words; from which it follows, that if particles were not ſignificant words, any one particle might be uſed (if indeed it could be of any uſe) to ſupply the place of all the reſt.

THE inaccuracy of this definition has not eſcaped the grammatical acumen of Mr. TOOKE; who diſcovered that moſt of the particles, in our Language, are Anglo-Saxon verbs or nouns; and has been thence led to conjecture, that all the particles of other tongues muſt be, of neceſſity, verbs or nouns.

THE following is a ſummary ſtatement of the arguments adduced in favor of the theory of Mr. TOOKE. *Firſt*, it appears, from the reſult of Mr. TOOKE's enquiries, that moſt of the

English particles are Anglo-Saxon verbs or nouns; *secondly*, it may be inferred, by analogy, that the hitherto undiscovered particles of the English Language are also obsolete verbs or nouns; *thirdly*, there is reason (so far as the enquiry has been hitherto carried) to form a similar judgment with regard to the particles of certain other tongues, ancient and modern; *fourthly*, there are very few particles in the infancy of Language; and the office of particles, in every uncultivated tongue, is commonly performed by verbs or nouns; *fifthly*, it is not probable that illiterate savages, the first cultivators of Language, should send abroad their faculties in quest of particles, that is to say, of words used to denote the abstract relations subsisting among their ideas; since nouns and verbs are sufficient for all the purposes of common speech; and *finally*, no Grammarian has been able to discover the *essential characteristic* of particles; or that which serves to distinguish a particle, from either of the other two parts of speech.*

But if the existence of particles, in the *present* state of any given language shall be once admitted, it will be always impossible to prove that they did not or might not exist in the infant state of every tongue; for if there be any such thing as a particle, contradistinguished from a verb or a noun, it must be absurd to affirm that there can be no such thing as a primitive particle. If the word *from* be now a particle, in our language, it will not therefore be of any importance to shew that it was once used, by the

* I have not, knowingly, omitted or mistated any of the arguments in favor of the theory of Mr. Tooke; but some of them, (particularly the last from which it is inferred, on grounds of probability, that particles are not essentially distinguished from either of the other two parts of speech), are extracted from the Grammatical Treatise in the Encyclopœdia Britannica; and I know not whether they are to be found in the Diversions of Purley or not. If I have fallen into any mistake of omission or commission, in the statement of these arguments, I beg the reader to believe that I would not *voluntarily* mislead his judgment. My object is truth; and though I believe it incumbent on me to give my opinions freely, on the subject of which I am treating, I am wholly unconscious of any desire to support a theory at the expence of truth. I have little to say on the subject of particles; and if my ideas, on the nature of that part of speech are founded in error; I shall be the willing convert of any body, who will take the trouble to set me right.

Anglo-Saxons; as a ſubſtantive noun to ſignify *the beginning*; for if it be not now an Engliſh ſubſtantive noun but a particle, the exiſtence of particles muſt be fully eſtabliſhed; and it will be abſolutely impoſſible to aſſign any reaſon of neceſſity (though ſuch an accident may often happen) why *any particle muſt have poſſeſſed formerly, a character different from that which it now poſſeſſes*.

Now, whatever may be thought of the preſent character of the word *from*, it will not be denied that there are many Engliſh words or terminations, (for I conceive the terminations of every language to be one ſpecies of particles,) which cannot, in their preſent ſtate, be accurately compriſed under either of the terms *verb* or *noun*; and, taking it for granted that the letter s of the plural number is one of theſe, I ſhall endeavour to aſcertain the true character of that letter, conſidered as a word or ſound ſignificant of a certain idea; and thence to infer the true nature of other words or ſounds, which muſt, like the letter s, be aſſigned to the claſs of particles; ſince they cannot be accurately aſſigned to either of the other two parts of ſpeech.

The letter s denotes plurality when added to the ſingular number of a ſubſtantive noun; as *houſe, houſes; pen, pens; &c.* but if the ſubſtantive noun be taken away, the letter s will no longer convey the idea of plurality, or any other idea, to an Engliſh ear. So alſo the two *Alifs*, in the word اقوال, the plural of قول *A ſpeech*, convey to the mind of an Arab the idea of plurality; but if the word قول be taken away, the two *Alifs* will no longer convey that, or any other idea, to his mind. And as it cannot be imagined that the two Alifs, *thus intermixed with the letters compoſing the word* قول *A ſpeech*, conſtitute the fragments of ſome obſolete and ſignificant word; ſo, it cannot be preſumed, unleſs we are prepared to prove the fact, that the letter s is the fragment of an Anglo-Saxon verb or noun. And if the fact were clearly proved, it would yet be a matter of no importance to the preſent

argu-

argument, unless we could also maintain that the letter s continues to be still a verb or a noun; for if that letter be now a particle, the present existence of particles must be fully established; and their existence at every former period of time must (as I think) be thence inferred.

Now the essence of every particle, or that which constitutes the distinction between it and either of the other two parts of speech, appears to me to consist in this; that NOUNS and VERBS are invariably significant in every proposition, because they are truly significant in their own right; whereas PARTICLES are not significant in every proposition, because they are not significant in their own right, but only, (as in the case of the plural *s*) in the right of some one or more words with which they must be therefore invariably connected. And the necessity of this connexion, to the significant character of every particle, will furnish the true criterion by which we shall be able to detect, on every occasion, the difference between a particle and the corresponding verb or noun.

To explain by an example. The word *from*, which is *now* a particle, denotes the same idea signified by the word *beginning*, which is a substantive noun. But the word *from* being a particle, (I speak of its present not of its past character) denotes the idea *as it exists in a given substantive noun by which it must be, therefore, invariably followed.* And if that noun be taken away, the meaning of the word *from* will disappear with it; just as the plural sense of the letter s disappears when the substantive noun is taken away. For we cannot substitute the word *from*, for the word *beginning*, in the following sentence; "In the *beginning*, GOD created the heavens and the earth," (I mean that we cannot say "In the *from*, GOD created the heavens and the earth,") and the reason is obvious; *namely*, because the word *from* does not, in this combination, convey to the mind of an Englishman the idea signified by the word *beginning*; and, if not *that* idea, it certainly conveys no other.

It

It may be inferred, therefore, that the word *from* (and so also of the letter s; if it shall be found, hereafter, that this letter corresponds, in point of sense, with any obsolete verb or noun) is now a particle, and that the word *beginning* is a substantive noun; and the difference between them consists, merely, in this; that though the idea signified by both is precisely the same; yet the noun, being significant in its own right, denotes that idea, or conveys it to the mind of the hearer, *without reference to any combination whatever;* (in other words the noun will be significant in every proposition;) whereas the particle denotes the idea *in a connected state;* and must, therefore, be accompanied by a given substantive noun, on which the significance of its character always depends. (In other words the particle will not be significant in every proposition).

And the nature of this dependence cannot be confounded with that of either of the other two parts of speech, on those words with which they must be connected in order to form a perfect proposition; for though it be true, that the word *beginning* is necessarily connected with some other substantive noun, which must be understood, if it be not expressed; as *the beginning of the year; the beginning of the century; the beginning of time; &c.* it is perfectly obvious, that the necessity of this connexion may be traced to the nature of the idea which the word *beginning* is formed to denote; and cannot be ascribed on any principle, to the unfitness of the word *beginning*, for conveying that idea to the mind of the hearer.

For the word *beginning*, being a substantive noun, and therefore significant in its own right, is never unfit to convey to the mind of the hearer, the idea which it was originally formed to denote; but the word *from*, though it denotes the same idea, is unfit to convey it to the hearer's mind, unless it be followed by a substantive noun. And hence it happens, that the word *beginning* may supply the place of the word *from*, in every example that can be adduced; (See the Diversions of Purley, vol. I,

page 341, et ſeq.) whereas the word *from* cannot ſupply the place of the word *beginning*, on any occaſion. But if the word *from* like the word *beginning*, were truly ſignificant in its own right, it would be quite impoſſible to aſſign any reaſon why either might not be uſed inſtead of both; and ſince we know that the word *from* cannot be ſo uſed, it may be thence inferred, with certain accuracy, that this word is not ſignificant of the idea which it was formed to denote, in every combination that can be conceived. For the place of the word *from* may be invariably ſupplied by the word *beginning*, which is a clear proof that both are uſed in the ſame ſenſe; and I aſk, therefore, in what conſiſts the difference between them if not in this, that the word *beginning* is a ſubſtantive noun, and therefore ſignificant in every combination; whereas the word *from* (like the letter s of the plural number, or like the two *Alifs* in اقوال, the plural of قول *A ſpeech;)* is a particle; that is to ſay, it is not ſignficant in every combination, but it is ſignificant in certain combinations; or in other words, it is ſignificant in the right of a given ſubſtantive noun, by which it muſt be therefore invariably followed.

It may be inferred, therefore, that the idea ſignified by the word *from*, is recogniſed by the mind *as it exiſts in the following ſubſtantive noun;* that is to ſay, the mind never dwells on the ſenſe of the word *from*, conſidered as a ſound ſignificant in its own right; and haſtens on the contrary, to combine it with that ſubſtantive noun, on which the ſignificance of its character always depends. Let the reader ſubſtitute the word *beginning* for the word *from*, in the following ſentence; "*The lamp hangs from the ceiling*," or "*The lamp hangs beginning the ceiling;*" and, by adverting to the manner in which theſe words are pronounced, he will clearly perceive a pauſe after the word *beginning*, which would be utterly miſplaced after the word *from*. The reaſon is obviouſly this; that the meaning of the word *from* is developed by the following ſubſtantive noun; whereas the meaning of the word *beginning* is recogniſed by the mind as its exiſts in that

word.

word. (*The beginning* IS *the ceiling.*) Or to expreſs the ſame ſentiment in another way, the word *beginning* is a ſubſtantive noun; and therefore ſignificant in its own right; whereas the word *from* is a particle; and therefore depends, for the ſignificance of its character, on a given ſubſtantive noun by which it muſt be followed in every ſentence.*

THERE is a condition, therefore, annexed to the ſignificance of every PARTICLE, which is never applicable to that of the correſponding VERB or NOUN; and, in the exiſtence of this condition, conſiſts the eſſence of every particle; or that which ſerves to diſtinguiſh a particle, from either of the other two parts of ſpeech. And hence it may be inferred, *firſt*, that if a word be truly ſignificant in its own right, it can be no particle, though it may be incapable of utterance when it ſtands alone; and, *ſecondly*, that if a word be not ſignificant in its own right, but only in the right of ſome one or more words with which it muſt be therefore invariably connected; it muſt be a particle, though it may be capable of utterance when it ſtands alone.

To explain by examples. The word FROM is a particle; becauſe I have already ſhewn that this word is not ſignificant in its own right, though it is obviouſly capable of utterance when it ſtands alone. And the CONJUNTIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS م, ت, and ش of the Perſian language are not particles; be-

* It has been ſtated to me, that the word *from* is not leſs ſignificant than the word *beginning*; for whether we ſay *the lamp hangs from*, or *the lamp hangs beginning*, the propoſition is equally imperfect; and the mind of the hearer will be equally impatient to hear the name of the place, from which the lamp begins to hang, in either caſe. This is unqueſtionably true; and I ſhall here obſerve once for all, that particles properly uſed, are not more or leſs ſignificant than nouns or verbs, properly uſed. The difference between them conſiſts in a circumſtance wholly foreign to this obſervation; *namely*, in the condition annexed to the ſignificance of every particle. Let that condition be preſent in a given propoſition, and the particle will be ſignificant in that propoſition: (I walked *from* London to Weſtminſter.) Let the condition be wanting, and the particle will become an unmeaning ſound. (In the *from* GOD created the heavens and the earth.) There is no ſuch condition as this annexed to the ſignificance of verbs or nouns; and theſe therefore will convey, in every poſſible propoſition, the idea which they were originally formed to denote.

cause they are truly significant in their own right, though they are not capable of utterance when they stand alone. For it must be inferred that every word is truly significant in its own right, if the contrary cannot be shewn by adverting to facts: that is to say, if the contrary cannot be shewn by adducing a specific proposition, in which a given word shall not convey the sense which it was formed to denote; and the contrary cannot be shewn in the case of the CONJUNCTIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS of the Persian language; *First*, because these are mutually interchangeable with the DISJUNCTIVE PRONOUNS; as اسپم or اسپ من *my Horse;* گفتمت or ترا گفتم *I said to thee;* زدمش or اورا زدم *I struck him; &c.* and, *Secondly*, because they retain their significance after particles, and other words, on which the significance of their character can have no dependance.

EXAMPLE.

اگرم حیات بخشی وگرم ممات خواهی سر بندگی بخدمت بنهم که پادشاهی

"WHETHER thou grantest me life, or desirest my death, I submit to thy will; for thou are the Lord."

THE reader will perceive that the *conjunctive personal pronoun* م, which occurs twice in these lines, is added, in both cases, to the particle اگر *If;* and as the pronoun can have no dependance on that particle for the significance of its character; so, it would be wholly insignificant in this combination, if it were not significant in its own right. For we cannot separate the letter (s) of the plural number, from that word on which the significance of its character always depends; as *Books; Papers; Pens; &c.* but we may separate the conjunctive personal pronouns of the Persian language from any given word without exception; provided, only, that we are careful to join them to another word in the same sentence. Thus

بخشی,

اگرم حیات بخشی, or اگر حیاتم بخشی, or اگر بخشیم حیات, might be uſed with equal accuracy to ſignify, "*If thou giveſt me life*;" and hence it is obvious, that theſe pronouns are truly ſignificant in their own right; though each of them, conſiſting only of a ſingle letter, is therefore incapable of utterance when it ſtands alone.

Having endeavoured to determine the general characteriſtic of all particles, I now proceed to obſerve, that it is not my intention, nor is it within the reach of my ability, to aſcertain the *preciſe condition*, by which the ſignificance of each particle muſt be reſtricted in our language; but I ſhall endeavour to furniſh the reader with one general key, (indeed I have already furniſhed a key) by which the accuracy of my principle may, I conceive, be eaſily brought to the teſt of experiment, in every example that can be adduced. Whenever it ſhall happen that either of two words, denoting preciſely the *ſame* idea, may invariably ſupply the place of both; it muſt be obvious, that theſe two words are exactly ſynonimous in every reſpect; but if this be true of one of them only, we are then to reconſider the queſtion; and if it ſhall ſtill appear, that the idea ſignified by both is preciſely the *ſame*; we muſt, of neceſſity, infer that the other does not, in every poſſible combination, convey the idea which it was formed to denote; or, in other words, that the ſignificance of the laſt is reſtricted by a certain condition (whatever it may be) which is not applicable to that of the firſt.

Now it fortunately happens, that moſt of the particles in our language have been traced to their origin by Mr. Tooke; who has been able, by adverting to the etymology of each particle, to determine the true ſenſe which it was formed to denote. And it is in the power of all my readers, by reverſing the proceſs which he has adopted, to aſcertain the conditional ſignificance of every particle; though it may be often a matter of conſiderable difficulty, to determine the *preciſe* condition, on which the ſignificance of a given particle may happen to depend.

For it does not appear (and I beg the readers particular attention to this observation) that those particles of which the origin has been traced by Mr. Tooke are now used in a sense different from that which they formerly possessed as nouns or verbs; and, on the contrary, those obsolete nouns or verbs, which are now become particles in our language, continue still to retain their primitive sense. This fact has been clearly established by Mr. Tooke, who has very successfully proved, that any given verb or noun may supply the place of the corresponding particle, in every example that can be adduced: a certain proof that the idea signified by both is, at this day, precisely the same.

I ask therefore (and I apply the question to every particle of which the origin has been traced by him) *why the opposite proposition is not equally true?* that is to say, why a particle, denoting precisely the same idea with any given verb or noun, shall not be able to supply its place, in every example that can be adduced. And if the coincidence or unity of idea for which I contend be not fallacious; it follows, that the inability of a particle, in any given example, to supply the place of the corresponding verb or noun, must be considered as a proof that the particle is not *significant* in that example; or, in other words, that it does not, in every possible combination, convey the idea which it was formed to denote. But if a word be not significant under every combination, it cannot be significant in its own right; for a word which is truly significant in its own right, has no dependence, for the significance of its character, on any combination whatever; that is to say, it must be equally significant, under every combination that can be conceived. (Accordingly, a verb or a noun will be found to be in fact significant, in every combination that can be conceived.) And if a word be not significant in its own right, it must be wholly insignificant in every combination; (which is not true of any particle) or it must be significant in certain combinations; that is to say, it must be significant in the right of some one or more words, with which it must be therefore

invariably

invariably connected: and this is the true definition of a particle properly ſo called.

To explain by examples. The particles *for, of, from, with, if, unleſs, yet, ſtill, though;* are ſtated, by Mr. TOOKE, to denote the ſame ideas ſignified by the words *cauſe, conſequence, beginning, join, give, diſmiſs, get, put, allow;* which are nouns or verbs in the imperative mode. But the particles cannot ſupply the place of the correſponding verbs or nouns, in the following, and other examples of the ſame nature: *Tell me the cauſe; Beware of the conſequence; Read from the beginning; Join the party; Give me a book; Diſmiſs the ſervant; Get me a chair; Put the caſe; Allow the fact; &c. &c. &c.* Whereas it appears, from the diſcoveries of Mr. TOOKE, that the nouns or verbs may ſupply the place of the correſponding particles, in every example that can be adduced. And, if the preceding obſervations be founded in truth, this circumſtance alone is ſufficient to determine the conditional ſignificance of theſe particles; that is to ſay, it proves, beyond the poſſibility of a doubt, that they muſt now be aſſigned to the claſs of particles, becauſe they are not ſignificant in every combination; (or, in other words, bacauſe they are not ſignificant in their own right;) and that they cannot, for the ſame reaſon, be now conſidered as nouns or verbs; whatever may have been their character in former times. The preciſe or particular condition, on which the ſignificance of each particle may happen to depend, is indeed another queſtion; the inveſtigation of which muſt, of neceſſity, be left to the ingenuity of the reader; ſince I have neither ability nor inclination to engage in the diſcuſſion.*

IF

* I ſhall here take notice of an objection, (the moſt formidable perhaps that can be urged) againſt the principle which I have endeavoured to eſtabliſh. It has been ſuggeſted to me by a friend, in whoſe judgment I have the utmoſt confidence, that either of two indiſputable verbs or nouns, denoting preciſely the ſame idea, may ſupercede the other in many of the common forms of ſpeech. From which it it ſtated to follow, according to the principle which I have eſtabliſhed, that the ſuperceded verb or the ſuperceded noun ought to be aſſigned to the claſs of particles; whereas they cannot, in point of fact, be accurately aſſigned to that claſs. The French adjective "latent," for example, has been ſuperceded

If I have been successful in my endeavour to establish the existence of particles in the present state of our language; and to demonstrate

---

ceded by the corresponding adjective "caché" in every form of speech but one; namely "vices latents" *concealed faults*; which is an expression used to denote certain disorders with which a horse may be afflicted, without having any appearances of them. I understand that if the adjective "caché" were employed for "latent" in the preceding example, as "vices cachés," the expression would be perfectly intelligible to any Frenchman; and, on the contrary, if the adjective "latent" were used for "caché" in any other form of speech, as "il est latent" for "il est caché" *He is concealed*; it is said that the expression, in that case, would be unintelligible to most people.

I have no doubt of the fact stated in this observation; namely, that the adjective "latent" cannot be accurately employed for the adjective "caché" in the preceding example, though both denote the same idea. And something of the same kind may be observed in the use of the English adjective "latent;" for though we often talk of "latent heat," we never say of a man that *he is latent*; because the expression, though not unintelligible, would be very quaint. Now the word "latent" is not a particle; and if it be indeed true, that it must be assigned to the class of particles, according to the principle which I have endeavoured to establish, I must be compelled to admit, that the principle itself is founded in error. But I deny that the word "latent," whether considered as a French or as an English adjective, can be unintelligible in any combination whatever; though it may be now obsolete in many combinations, and may become so hereafter in every combination.

For if it were affirmed in common language that "the lamp hangs *beginning* the ceiling" such an expression would be doubtless faulty; and might be said, in some sense, to be unintelligible; because the word *from*, in the common practice of the English Language, is never superceded by the word *beginning*, in any example of this nature. It cannot however be admitted, (nor will the concession be demanded by any disciple of Mr. Tooke) that the word *beginning* is really insignificant in this example; for on the contrary, we have Mr. Tooke's authority to assert the significance of that word, as well in this example, as in many others equally remote from the common usage of the English tongue.

Now I admit that the expression "il est latent" may be so far unintelligible as to be at variance with the common usage of the French tongue; but as it cannot be shewn that the word "latent" depends for the significance of its character on any combination whatever; so, I conceive that it must be and is significant in the preceding, as well as in every other combination that can be imagined. Of a particle, on the contrary, it may be always shewn that the significance of its character depends on a certain combination; as that of the two *Alifs* in اقوال the plural of قول *A speech.* And if that combination shall happen to be absent in a given proposition, the particle will lose all significance in that proposition; just as the two *Alifs*, which indicate plurality in their combination with قول, are wholly insignificant when the word قول is taken away. I conceive therefore, according to this principle, that *In the from* is an expression as completely destitute of meaning as *In the if*; or *In the of*; or *In the by*; or *In the with*; &c. &c. notwithstanding the fact that the word *from*, when properly used, (that is to say, when followed by a given substantive noun,) denotes the same idea signified by the word *beginning*. And the reason is obvious; namely, because the significance of the word *from* is not less dependant on its combination with the following substantive noun, than is that of the two *Alifs*, on their combination with the word قول, or any other word, of which they may be employed to form the plural number.

Let

demonſtrate, their dependance, for ſignificance of character, on other words with which they muſt be therefore invariably connected; it will be a matter of little difficulty, to furniſh arguments of conſiderable weight, againſt the admiſſion of that doctrine which it ſeems to be the object of Mr. TOOKE's book to eſtabliſh; *namely*, that all the particles of every language muſt have been originally verbs or nouns.

FOR though the fact may be true (and I have neither occaſion nor ability to diſpute its truth) in the caſe of all the Engliſh particles of which the etymology has been traced by him; it does not therefore follow, that we have any right to extend the inference by analogy, to any one particle of which the origin remains unknown. Nay, I ſhall venture to affirm, in direct oppoſition to this doctrine, that we are bound by all the principles of

---

Let it be ſhewn that the ſignificance of the word "latent" depends on any combination of this nature, and I ſhall be juſtified in aſſigning that word to the claſs of particles; but as this cannot poſſibly be ſhewn becauſe in fact it is not true, ſo, it follows, that we muſt of neceſſity admit the *ſelfſignificance* of that word. And of every ſelfſignificant word I have already remarked that no poſſible combination can deſtroy the ſignificance of its character; or, in other words, that it muſt be ſignificant in every combination that can be conceived; from which it follows, that "il eſt latent" *is* and *muſt be* an intelligible expreſſion; though it may be alſo true, that a good writer would refrain from its adoption, adverting to the common uſage of the French tongue.

The preceding arguments appear to me to be quite concluſive, unleſs it ſhall be maintained that *In the from* is not leſs intelligible than "il eſt latent;" firſt, becauſe *from* ſignifies the *beginning*; and ſecondly, becauſe *In the beginning* is clearly the member of an intelligible ſentence. I cannot anſwer this argument otherwiſe than by a ſimple denial of the fact. If it be true that the word *from*, like the word *beginning*, is truly ſignificant in its own right; the argument is doubtleſs unanſwerable; and the diſtinction between the noun and the particle muſt of neceſſity fall to the ground. But I have endeavoured to demonſtrate the reality of this diſtinction, as well in the caſe of the word *from*, as in the caſe of many other words; and it is incumbent on thoſe who deny its exiſtence, to ſupport their opinions by arguments drawn from exiſting tongues. How they will be able to do this I am not prepared to anticipate, becauſe the poſition appears to me to be at variance with the uſage of every tongue. I ſhall therefore only remark, (what indeed I have remarked already) that it will be of no conſequence to ſhew that the word *from*, (or any other particle,) being a verb or a noun among the Anglo-Saxons, was *once* ſignificant in its own right; becauſe I have never denied that any given particle *may* have been formerly a verb or a noun. The preſent queſtion relates merely to the *exiſting* difference between all thoſe words which are *now* particles, as oppoſed to others which are nouns or verbs; and this difference having, as I conceive, been fully eſtabliſhed in the preceding part of this chapter, it remains to be ſhewn in the ſequel, how little reaſon there is to believe that every particle *muſt* have been formerly a verb or a noun.

just reasoning, to believe every particle to have possessed formerly and at all times the same character which it now possesses; unless the contrary can be shewn by adverting to facts. For there is nothing in the nature of any one particle, which can lead (as a matter of necessity) to such an inference in the case of another; and it seems to me, indeed, that the deduction by analogy is not much more tenable than it would be, to maintain that all the *sailors* in the world were formerly *soldiers;* because the fact may be true in many cases.

And accordingly, if it be asked why the letter s of the plural number must have possessed formerly a character different from that which it now possesses; or, in other words, why the letter s must have been formerly a verb or a noun; the question of *necessity* must be instantly relinquished, because it is wholly untenable on any principle: and unless the fact can be established by adverting to evidence, it will then remain to be considered, what reason there is for its admission on the ground of probability alone. But here, also, the advocate of Mr. Tooke's principles may be opposed by arguments much more cogent than convenient for his purpose; for the whole system of Arabic inflexion, and more especially the formation of the plural number, presents a series of obstacles to the admission of his principles; which no etymologist will *undertake* to remove. Let it be admitted (as it cannot surely be denied) that the two *Alifs*, in أَقْوَال the plural of قَوْل *A speech*, were never significant of plurality in their own right; and it follows directly from this admission, that we have no right to assume the self significance of the letter s; unless we are prepared to prove the fact. And so, also, if it be granted that there is no word or sound self significant of plurality, in كُتُب the plural of كِتَاب *A book;* the same inference will follow of course.

In short, it is only necessary to direct the reader's attention to the *whole structure of the Arabic Language,* considered with reference

ference to that of the English, or of any other tongue; and if he shall find, (as he must find) that the office of our terminations is performed among the Arabs by various letters, which intersect the radical in all its points; (as الف in عاشق *A lover*; ميم and واو in معشوق *Beloved*; *&c. &c. &c.*) he will then be sufficiently indisposed to admit, without positive evidence of the fact, that any given termination (such as *er* in *lover*, or *ed* in *loved*) *must* have been formerly a verb, or a noun.

It may be inferred therefore, that Mr. Tooke was mistaken when (having occasion to speak of the particle *to*, and of those terminations which mark the infinitive in most of the European tongues) he stated his opinion that "all these terminations may be "traced to their respective origin; and that, however artificial they "may now appear to us, they were not, originally, the effect of "premeditated and deliberate *art*; but separate words, by length of "time corrupted, and coalescing with the words of which they are "now considered as the *terminations*". (See Diversions of Purley, vol. I, page 352.) For, if one termination shall be, indeed, the effect of premeditated and deliberate art; it is obvious that another may be so too; and, so long as the contrary cannot be shewn by adverting to facts, we have a right to assume, (nay we are bound to assume) that every given termination is the effect of premeditated and deliberate art; unless it can be shewn that art has nothing to do in the structure of language.

But the principles of Arabic inflexion appear to me, to evince beyond the possibility of doubt, that art has a great deal to do in the structure of *that* language; and therefore, in all probability, of every other: for how can we account for the existence of the words فضل or فضيلت *Excellence*; and of its derivatives فضائل ؛ فاضل ؛ فضّال ؛ مفضول ؛ افضل ؛ افاضل ؛ مفضال ؛ تفضيل ؛ افضال ؛ تفضّل ؛ &c. &c. &c. without having recourse to the aid of art! It may be surely assumed, (if there

be

be any certainty in human reafon) that the very artificial ftructure of thefe derivatives cannot be afcribed to the progrefs of corruption, by the moft determined etymologift that ever exifted; and if any one of them, as فَاضِل for example, fhall be truly the refult of deliberate art; how can we be affured that art has no fhare in the ftructure of our own more fimple tongue?

THE difcovery of a language devoid of art would, indeed, be anomalous in the hiftory of the human mind; fince it may be affirmed, that fuch a language, proceeding on no fixed principles whatever, would be wholly independent on the rules of Grammar. But no fuch language will be ever difcovered; becaufe the ftructure of every tongue muft be determined by the reafon (not the caprice) of the inventors; and the form of any given derivative, whether it be a verb or a noun, being fixed at firft by accident alone, will infallibly ferve as a precedent, to determine that of many others. The only queftion to be confidered confifts, therefore, not in the introduction of art into the ftructure of language; for of that, there cannot be the fmalleft doubt; but merely, in the truth or falfhood of the following propofition; *namely*, whether the inventors of a given language *did* or *did not* poffefs the fkill neceffary to invent primitive particles, which were not originally verbs or nouns. And, as the ftructure of the Arabic Language evinces the moft confummate art and fkill; (for what fyftem of inflexion can be more comprehenfive, or more admirably adapted to the purpofes of fpeech than that of Arabia?) fo, it is a fatire on the judgment of other nations, to decide this queftion in the negative; and to afcribe every ufeful contrivance of language, not to the *ingenuity* of the inventors; but merely to the progrefs of corruption alone *.

AND,

* It is particularly remarkable of Mr. TOOKE's fyftem, that though he admits the introduction of particles to be an improvement in Language, (comparing a Language without particles to a cart without wheels) he demands our unqualified affent to his propofition, *that the ufe of them muft be every where traced to the progrefs of corruption*; or, in other words, that all particles are corrupted verbs or nouns: as if the invention of a primitive

And, if it be confidered that the moft important improvements in the machinery now employed in various manufactures, have been the invention, not of philofophers but of *common workmen;* poffeffed of no theoretical knowledge whatever, but merely of that practical fkill refulting from the occupations in which they were daily engaged; (See Wealth of Nations, vol. I, page 16,) it will not be deemed incredible that men, living in the rudeft age, might yet be capable, by their ingenuity, of improving Language. For every Language may be confidered as a great *machine;* in the ufe of which thofe who fpeak it, (however deficient in theory,) have acquired a confiderable degree of practical fkill; and as their thoughts muft be naturally turned to its improvement, becaufe every man defires to exprefs his fentiments in the fhorteft poffible way; fo, they might eafily hit on primitive particles, (as the letter s of the plural number) which were not originally verbs or nouns.

That fuch particles have been invented, is not, however, a matter of conjecture; for if the ftructure of the Arabic Language fhall not be explained in a manner confiftent with the principles of Mr. Tooke, it follows that his principles are not accurately applicable to every tongue; and we fhall then be furnifhed with a fufficient motive for doubting the accuracy of their application to all the particles of *any* given Language; unlefs the fact fhall be proved, in the cafe of each particle, by deducing its origin from a verb or a noun. That the fact has been very fully proved by Mr. Tooke, in the cafe of many Englifh particles, is indeed a propofition which cannot be denied; but there is yet much to be done, before the non-exiftence of primitive particles in the Englifh Language can be certainly affirmed; and, as a principle of

primitive particle were an effort of ingenuity above the reach of the human mind. I believe, on the contrary, that primitive particles are common to every tongue; and that no language can exift long, before their obvious utility will fuggeft their invention. They will not indeed be numerous in a barbarous tongue, becaufe particles, whether primitive or derivative, are not numerous in any tongue; and becaufe they muft be expected (like the nouns and the verbs) to be much lefs numerous in a barbarous than they are in a polifhed Language.

General Grammar, the propoſition ſeems to me to be wholly untenable on every account.

If the preceding obſervations ſhall be thought to eſtabliſh the exiſtence of *terminations*, which were not originally verbs or nouns; it will be eaſy to extend the ſame principle, to the prepoſitions and the conjunctions of every tongue. For the office of every prepoſition might be ſuperceded, by multiplying the caſes of a ſubſtantive noun; as *Regis*, *Of a King*; *Regi*, *To a King*; *Rege*, *With a King*; *Regibus*, *To or With Kings*; *&c.*

And, if the terminations employed in the formation of theſe caſes were not originally verbs or nouns, in every example that can be adduced; it will be wholly impoſſible to aſſign any reaſon of neceſſity why the correſponding prepoſitions muſt have been ſo; becauſe the ingenuity exerciſed in the invention of both, is preciſely the ſame in kind and degree. It is true, indeed, that the termination follows the noun; but ſo alſo do the *poſtpoſitions* of the Hindooſtanee tongue. It is alſo true, that the termination coaleſces with the ſubſtantive noun; whereas the prepoſition ſtands by itſelf. But a very little reflexion will enable us to perceive that there is no eſſential difference between them; and that each approaches ſo nearly to the nature and character of the other, as to render it wholly impoſſible to eſtabliſh or deſtroy the exiſtence of one, by any arguments which will not be equally applicable to the other alſo. For it is common to *both* to depend, for ſignificance of character, on other words with which they muſt be therefore invariably connected; and the difference between them conſiſts, merely, in the very unimportant accidents of *poſition*; and *coaleſcence* or *non-coaleſcence*; which cannot, in the leaſt, diminiſh or augment the difficulty of their invention by a rude people. I ſay, therefore, that the invention of any given *termination*, which was not originally a verb or a noun, is not more or leſs difficult, than the invention of a given *prepoſition* which was not originally a verb or a noun; or, in other words, that the ſame

arguments

arguments which demonstrate the existence of one, must be of equal force, when applied to the other.

It is impossible, perhaps, to place the existence of primitive *conjunctions* in so clear a light; because the office of conjunctions cannot be commonly performed by *terminations*; or, by any other species of *particles* with which, in that case, they might be compared. But as it cannot be shewn, that any difficulty attends the invention of primary *conjunctions*, which is not also applicable to the invention of primary *prepositions*; so it seems to me that the existence of both must be confirmed or refuted *by the same evidence*. For, if it be granted that any given pre-preposition was not, originally, a verb or a noun; it will be wholly impossible to assign any plausible reason, why the inventor of the *preposition*, might not be the inventor of a *conjunction* also; the ingenuity, required in both cases, being exactly the same in kind and degree. And hence it may be inferred, *first*, that the same difficulties attend the invention of *all* particles of every species; and *secondly*, that if these difficulties have not every where prevented the invention of every particle, whether it be a *preposition*; *a termination*; or *a conjunction*; it is then most probable, that *particles of every kind have been invented by all nations*; or, to express the same sentiment in other words, we are not at liberty to assume the opposite proposition, in the case of any one particle, of which the origin remains unknown.

But if there be any such thing as primitive particles, it follows, as a matter of course, that the meaning of every particle cannot be discovered by the aid of *etymology*. For though we may still endeavour to trace the meaning of many particles, or of all particles that are not primitive, by having recourse to this aid; it must yet be obvious, that as often as we meet a primitive particle, our endeavours will be continually baffled; because such a particle must have possessed, formerly and at all times, the same character which it now possesses.

It does not however follow, of neceſſity, that the meaning of a primitive particle cannot be diſcovered in any way; and, on the contrary, I am diſpoſed to believe that the oppoſition of ſenſe in certain particles, (ſuch as *to* and *from*) and, generally ſpeaking, the application of every particle by the beſt writers in our own language, will furniſh a ſufficient criterion to guide our judgment, in fixing the ſenſe which it was formed to denote. For Mr. Tooke has aſcertained the true ſenſe of the definite article *the* which is doubtleſs a particle; (and, ſo far as I know, a primitive particle; ſince I am not aware that it was formerly a verb or a noun among the Anglo-Saxons) without having recourſe to the aid of etymology; and ſo alſo, the Arabian Grammarians have diſcovered the particles من *From*, and إلى *To*, to be ſynonimous in point of ſenſe, with ابتدا *The beginning*, and انتها *The end;* though they are not at all connected with theſe words, in point of etymology.

It muſt be admitted, however, that many Arabic and Perſian particles are ſuppoſed to convey more than one idea; and if it be true, as Mr. Tooke ſeems to believe, that every word denotes invariably the ſame idea, in every example that can be adduced; it muſt then be inferred, that the Arabs, like the Engliſh, have often miſtaken the meaning of their own particles. But I have endeavoured, on a former occaſion, to ſhew that any given verb or noun may denote more than one idea; (See Note, page 388) and if the principle there explained be accurately applicable to nouns and verbs, it will be quite impoſſible to aſſign any reaſon why its application may not be extended to particles alſo. In this caſe, the Arabian Grammarians may poſſibly be in the right, when they aſſign more than one ſenſe to moſt of their particles.

It only remains to be remarked, that certain reputed prepoſitions, ſuch as *Before* and *After*, *Within*, *Without*, *Between*, *Behind*, *Above*, *Below*, *Up* and *Down*, *Among*, *Over*, *Under*, *Near*, and

and perhaps many others, cannot be accurately aſſigned to the claſs of particles, according to the principle which I have endeavoured to eſtabliſh, becauſe they are truly ſignificant in their own right. Theſe nouns denote, not indeed the names of any ſpecific or poſitive time or place; but like the words *front, rear, &c.* they are invariably the names of a given time, or a given place, conſidered with reference to ſome other time or place. Thus the word *above* is the name of any given place, which is higher than ſome other place preſent to the mind of the ſpeaker who employs that word; and ſo, alſo, the word *before* is the name of any given time or place, preceding another time, or another place, which is ſignified by the word *after*, or the word *behind*. Accordingly, the correſponding terms in the Perſian Language, as بالا *Above*, زير *Below*, پيش *Before*, پس *Behind*, or *After*, اندرون *Within*, بيرون *Without*, ميان *The middle*, or *Between*, بر *Near*, *&c. &c.* are aſſigned to that claſs of nouns which is known to Grammarians by the term ظروف.

And, in the Perſian Language, they are invariably followed by the اضافت, or that particle which marks the ſecond of two ſubſtantive nouns to be in the genetive caſe: a circumſtance in which they differ from the correſponding terms in the Engliſh Language, which do not generally (though ſome of them do occaſionally) govern the following ſubſtantive nouns in the genetive caſe. Examples: بالاى آسمان *Above (of) the Heavens*; زير زمين *Under (of) the Earth*; پيش قاضى *Before (of) the Judge*; پس خانه *Behind (of) the Houſe*; اندرون مسجد *Within (of) the Temple*; بيرون شهر *Without (of) the City*; ميان لشكريان *Amidſt (of) the Soldiers*; بر حق *Near (of)* God; or *In the ſight of* God; *&c. &c. &c.*

In common with all other nouns of the claſs termed ظروف, the prepoſition which ought to govern theſe nouns is commonly omitted; but it may be accurately expreſſed after moſt of them; and

perhaps after them all. Examples: برِبالای آسمان *Above* or *On the top of the Heavens*; بزِیرِ زمین *Below* or *In the under part of the Earth*; دَرپسِ خانه *Before* or *In front of the Judge*; درپیشِ قاضی *Behind* or *In the rear of the House, &c.* So, also, the preposition which ought to govern any other ظرف is very often omitted; as شبِ معراج or روزِ قیامت برروزِ قیامت *On the Day of Judgment*; or بشبِ معراج *On the night of the Ascension*; (MOHUMMUD's ascension into Heaven on the beast براق; &c. &c. &c.)

As these reputed prepositions have been assigned to the class of nouns, so the substantive verb اَست *Is*, together with the vowel *Kusra*, and the letter ن, (which were anciently used in the sense of the substantive verb,) have been assigned to the class of particles, by the Grammarians of Persia. For the word است denotes, merely, that relation which exists between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition; as زیدنیک است ZYDE *is good*; عمرخوش است AMR *is happy*; *&c.* and is not, like our substantive verb, or like the Persian substantive verb هست, significant of *existence* when it stands alone. So, also, the vowel کسره and the letter ن, when joined to the end of the predicate of a given proposition, were anciently significant of the same relation; as نیکن *He is good*; خوشن *He is happy*; زیددبیر ZYDE *is a writer*; *&c.* But they have long become obsolete in that sense, and the memory of their occurrence is no where preserved, but in the prefatory dissertations of certain Lexicographers. It seems to me, however, that if the vowel کسره and the letter ن be truly particles when thus used; the substantive verb must be also a particle, of that species which is known to Grammarians by the term روابط or *Connectives*.

BEING ignorant of the sources of the Arabic and Persian Tongues, I am wholly unqualified to trace the corruptions that may have crept into these tongues in the course of time; and cannot, therefore,

therefore, hazard an opinion on the probable ſucceſs of any future etymologiſt, who ſhall undertake to account for the Arabic and Perſian particles, on the principles of Mr. Tooke. That many of theſe particles may have been formerly verbs or nouns, is indeed very poſſible; but I cannot ſtimulate enquiry by the production of any examples deſerving of notice. The following have occurred, I believe, to moſt of the admirers of Mr. Tooke's ſyſtem, who know any thing of the Perſian Tongue: دَر *A door*; در *In*; عَلَى *Upon*; عُلُوّ *Height*; بَر *The boſom*; بَر *Near*; and alſo *Upon*; گَر *If*; گِير *Grant*; or *Allow*; هَمْرَاه *A fellow traveller*; هَمْرَاه *With*; اگرچه *Although*; compounded of چه *What?* and گر *If*; &c.

It is to be obſerved, however, *firſt*, that گَر is itſelf a contraction of اگَر; *ſecondly*, that الف cannot be introduced into the imperative گِير; *thirdly*, that the letter يا, ſo far as I know, was never introduced into the particle گَر; and *finally*, that گِر with كسره, not گَر with فتحه, ſeems to be the moſt natural and analogous contraction of گِير. I think it doubtful, therefore, whether the particle گَر is at all connected with the imperative گِير. It may be alſo obſerved, that هَمْرَاه is not at this day a prepoſition, but a compounded ſubſtantive noun; and that بَر is not a prepoſition when it ſignifies *Near*. Accordingly, theſe nouns require to be invariably followed by the اضافت; as هَمْرَاهِ مَن *With me*; بَرِ مَن *Near me*; &c. The word بَر is ſuppoſed to be a prepoſition when it ſignifies *On*, or *Upon*; and does not, in this caſe, admit the اِضَافَت. Example: بَر اَسْپ سُوَار اَسْت *He is mounted on horſeback*; &c. There may be other examples, beſides thoſe which I have now detailed, but they do not, at preſent, occur to my recollection; and it would be a waſte of time to look for them, becauſe I am certain that Mr. Tooke's principles have never been ſucceſsfully applied to the Arabic or the Perſian Tongue.

PLAN

PLAN OF THE SYNTAX.

THE ſcience of Grammar is every where divided into the two branches of INFLEXION and SYNTAX; the firſt treating of the *formation* of words; and the ſecond, of their *application* to the proposes of ſpeech. The materials of both are preciſely the ſame; but the object, to be accompliſhed, is obviouſly different in either caſe. It is the buſineſs of INFLEXION to arrange, in their proper order, every claſs of words that may happen to enter into the compoſition of a given Language; to define the ſpecific difference exiſting between them; and to detail the rules applicable to the formation of each claſs. It is the buſineſs of SYNTAX to conſider, in the ſame order, the application of theſe words to the purpoſes of ſpeech.

IN a Grammar perfectly regular, every chapter of inflexion would be therefore accompanied by a correſponding chapter of ſyntax; *firſt*, becauſe the definition or the formation of any given claſs of words, whether primitive or derivative, might furniſh matter for a chapter of inflexion; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe the application of the ſame claſs, to the purpoſes of ſpeech, might furniſh matter for a chapter of ſyntax. But there is not any ſuch thing as a perfectly regular Grammmar in any Language; and the imperfections incident to every tongue, as well as the advantages of brevity, and other cauſes, have univerſally occaſioned the adoption of various arrangements, wholly different, and much leſs perfect in their own nature, than that to which I have now adverted.

FOR every Grammar, though it were otherwiſe perfect, muſt yet partake of thoſe theoretical defects, which are incident to the ſtructure of the Language of which it treats; and if it happens (as in the Peſian Language and perhaps in moſt others) that the operation of general principles is often ſuperceded by the occurrence of particular exceptions, it will then be very difficult,

though

though not wholly impoſſible, to preſerve a clear and perſpicuous arrangement, in detailing the rules of inflexion or ſyntax that may happen to be applicable to that Language. For, on the one hand, the ſame rule of inflexion will be often applicable to the formation of various nouns eſſentially differing from each other in their own nature; as کردار *Action;* خریدار *A purchaser;* کشتار *Slain;* *&c. &c. &c.* and, on the other hand, oppoſite rules will be often applicable to the formation of various nouns of the ſame claſs; as نیکی *Goodneſs;* رنج *Sorrow;* تبش *Fever;* and other examples of that nature.

And hence it follows, that either of two arrangements are offered to the choice of every Grammarian, who has occaſion to treat the inflexion of ſuch a language. For on the one hand he may compriſe, in the ſame chapter, every word which is formed by the application of the ſame rule; and in this caſe a great variety of nouns, eſſentially differing from each other in their own nature, will be often jumbled together in that chapter; or on the other hand he may treat, in the ſame chapter, of every word which belongs by ſignification to the ſame claſs; and in this caſe he muſt repeat every rule, as often as it may be applicable to words which are not, by ſignification, of the ſame claſs.

The firſt arrangement appears to me to be the worſt; becauſe it has an obvious tendency to confound together two or more words which belong, by ſignification, to oppoſite claſſes; and of which, therefore, the application to the purpoſes of ſpeech cannot be the ſame. And, in a Grammar written on that plan, it will be wholly impoſſible to preſerve any connexion, or unity of deſign, between the inflexion and the ſyntax of a given language; becauſe the claſſification of every word is determined, in the ſyntax, not by the arbitrary rules which guide its formation; but merely by the *ſenſe* which it may happen to denote.

THE last arrangement is that which I have adopted in treating of the formation of Arabic and Persian nouns; and the following are the reasons which determined my choice. *First*, the structure of the Arabic Language naturally suggests the adoption of this plan, which has been chosen, accordingly, by all the Grammarians who have had occasion to treat of that language: *Secondly*, a clear and perspicuous arrangement of all the nouns, which enter into the composition of every Tongue, might be formed according to this plan, because it admits of no criterion, to determine the proper classification of every word, but that of the sense which it may happen to denote: *Thirdly*, the structure of the Persian or of any other language cannot, therefore, present any obstacles to the universal adoption of this plan: *Fourthly*, it is the duty of every Grammarian, to arrange into classes the words of which he has occasion to treat; and to assign to the same class every word, however formed, which is essentially the same in its nature and character: *Fifthly*, if this plan shall not be adopted in treating of inflexion, it must yet be adopted in treating of syntax; because the just application of words to the purposes of speech constitutes the true and proper end of syntax; which does not, therefore, recognise any distinction between two or more words, but that which depends on the difference of their nature; that is to say, on the nature of the various ideas which they are formed to denote: *Sixthly*, it can be charged with no inconvenience but that which I have mentioned; *namely*, the necessity of repeating the same rule as often as it may be applicable to the formation of two or more words which are not, by signification, of the same class: and, *finally*, its general adoption would introduce into all the Grammars in the world that unity of plan, which ought, in my opinion, to pervade them all.

BUT though I have generally endeavoured to assign to the same class every word which is essentially the same in its nature and character; I have not thought it necessary to *complete* the plan, by

admitting

admitting into the ſyſtem of inflexion, *every claſs of words without exception*, which enters into the compoſition of the Perſian Tongue. On the contrary, the primitive NOUNS, PRONOUNS, and PARTICLES, of the Perſian Language, have been wholly omitted; *firſt*, becauſe the formation of theſe words admits of no illuſtration by the rules of Grammar; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe it follows, that their application to the purpoſes of ſpeech, which is a matter of ſyntax, forms the only reaſonable object of Grammatical enquiry.

THE plan which I intend to purſue in treating the ſyntax, will be nearly the ſame with that which I have followed in treating the inflexion of the Perſian Tongue: that is to ſay, I ſhall ſelect a certain claſs of words (ſuch as the pronouns for example) to form the ſubject of a given chapter; and having detailed the rules which may appear to regulate their application to the purpoſes of ſpeech, I ſhall then proceed to another claſs; and ſo on, through moſt of the مُفْرَدات or *Single words*, whether NOUNS, VERBS, or PARTICLES, that enter into the compoſition of the Perſian Tongue.

THE abſolute completion of this part of the plan would leave nothing to be conſidered in the ſecond or third parts, into which I intend to divide the ſyntax; but it muſt be obvious, that certain combinations, ſuch as that of *two ſubſtantive nouns*, or of a *ſubſtantive followed by an adjective noun*, require to be conſidered in ſeparate chapters. The ſecond part of the ſyntax will therefore treat of thoſe IMPERFECT COMBINATIONS, (مُرَكَّبات ناقِصه) which do not form a complete or perfect ſentence; and the third part will treat of the مُرَكَّبات تامّه; that is to ſay, of thoſe combinations which form A COMPLETE AND PERFECT SENTENCE.

IT only remains to be ſtated, that the plan of the ſyntax, like that of the inflexion, will not require me to notice every

claſs

class of words, without exception, which enter into the composition of the Persian Tongue. On the contrary, I reserve to myself the option of omitting entirely all those words, of which the application, to the purposes of speech, shall seem to be incapable of illustration by the rules of Grammar. And, on the other hand, I shall not scruple to point out those defects, in the execution of my plan, which may occur to my notice in the course of its progress: for the syntax of the Persian Language has not been hitherto successfully treated by any Grammarian of Europe or Asia; and as I cannot expect to be every way fortunate in the completion of a work, which has baffled the industry of all my predecessors; so, I shall not be ashamed to own the cases, in which it may appear to myself, that matter of enquiry is left for those who shall follow hereafter in the same tract.

COMPOSITION AND DIVISION OF SENTENCES.

A SENTENCE has been defined, by the Persian Grammarians to be *a combination of words, so arranged, as to convey some information to the mind of the hearer.* Every sentence may be followed, therefore, by the silence of the speaker, since it must comprise in itself, all that is essential to its intelligible character. The words كلام, جمله, مركب اسنادي, and مركب تام, are indifferently used to signify *a sentence*; but the word جمله may also signify *The member of any compounded sentence, comprising, within itself, the three terms of a given proposition*; whereas the word كلام cannot be applied to any part of a sentence, whether simple or compounded, which is less than the whole. Thus, if it be affirmed of an individual that "He follows the same profession which his father followed," the term جمله will be separately applicable to either member of the sentence, or jointly applicable to both members; and the term كلام will be applicable to both, but cannot be applied to either member.

And

And in the event of the occurrence of a copulative conjunction, as "The judge condemned the criminal and his accomplices in guilt," the term جمله, like the term كلام, will not be applicable to any part of the sentence which is less than the whole; unless the verb (condemned) be repeated in the second member of the sentence: in which case, both terms will be applicable to each member.*

T follows, from the preceding definition of the term جمله, that this term must be applicable to any given substantive noun in the vocative case; as "O my father," "O my brother," &c. or to an oath; as والله, in the words والله لافعلن كذا *By* GOD *I will certainly do so and so*; and it is so applied, accordingly, by the Persian Grammarians. For the use of the VOCATIVE might be superceded in speech, by adopting instead of it the verb *To call*; followed by a given substantive noun; as "O my brother," "I call my brother," "O my father," "I call my father," &c. And an oath requires to be accompanied by the verb *I swear*; which is invariably understood if it be not expressed; as والله or اقسم بالله *I swear by* GOD, and other examples of the same nature. It is obvious, therefore, that an oath, or a substantive noun in the vocative case, or either of the words YES or NO, which supply the place of a perfect sentence, comprises virtually, though not verbally, the three terms of a proposition; and there is nothing else but this necessary to constitute a جمله as already explained. The term sen-

* When the verb is repeated, the Persian Grammarians say that the conjunction *and* is employed to join together two propositions; *namely*, "The judge condemned the criminal," "The judge condemned his accomplices." This is termed عطف جمله بر جمله or *The junction of two sentences*; to each of which the term كلام will be obviously applicable. When the verb is not repeated, they say that the same conjunction is employed to join together the two substantive nouns; namely, *the criminal*; and *his accomplices*. This is termed عطف مفرد بر مفرد; and the whole together will form, in that case, but a single sentence.

ſence will be uſed hereafter in the ſame ſenſe with the term جمله; but I ſhall diſtinguiſh, in every neceſſary caſe, the difference between a perfect complex ſentence, and the various perfect members or propoſitions of which it is compoſed.

It has already been ſtated that every ſentence muſt, virtually or verbally, compriſe in itſelf the three terms of a propoſition; as زيد آمد ZYDE *came*; عمر نوينده است AMR *is a writer*; &c. THE SUBJECT of the propoſition is termed مبتدا; or مسند اليه; or موضوع; or محكوم عليه; as oppoſed to THE PREDICATE; which is termed خبر; or مسند; or محكوم به; or محمول. The relation exiſting between them is known by the terms نسبت ايجابي, when it happens to be affirmative; or نسبت سلبي, when it happens to be negative; as زيد آمد ليكن عمر نيامد ZYDE *came, but* AMR *did not come.* If the three terms of the propoſition be verbally expreſſed, (the predicate not being an active, a paſſive, or a neuter verb) they will conſiſt of the مبتدا or *Subject of the propoſition*; the خبر or *Predicate of the propoſition*; and the رابط or *Mark of connexion*; as زيد نوينده است ZYDE *is a writer*; &c. But if the predicate be a neuter verb or a tranſitive verb in the active or paſſive voice, it will then be termed فعل معروف or فعل مجهول; and the ſubject will be termed فاعل; or مفعول مالم يسم فاعله that is to ſay, *the nominative to an active, or a paſſive verb.* Examples; زيد آمد ZYDE *came*; عمر كشته شد AMR *was killed*; &c.

If a given ſentence ſhall convey an aſſertion, it muſt be open to the ſuſpicion of truth and falſhood; that is to ſay, it may be affirmed to be partly or wholly true or falſe; becauſe every aſſertion muſt, by its very nature, be partly or wholly true or falſe. A ſentence of this claſs is termed جمله خبريه or *An aſſertive ſentence*, by the Perſian Grammarians; as زيد نوينده است ZYDE

is

is a writer, &c. And, if a given ſentence ſhall not convey an aſſertion, it muſt convey an intreaty, a prayer, a command, &c. and will be conſequently formed by a verb in the imperative or precative modes; as when we ſay to a ſervant, *Be honeſt; ſober; diligent; virtuous;* and other examples of the ſame nature. A ſentence of this claſs will not be open to the ſuſpicion of truth and falſhood, becauſe there is nothing affirmed to be true or falſe. On the contrary, the ſpeaker commands or deſires the *creation or exiſtence of a new attribute*, (as ſobriety, honeſty, diligence, or virtue,) in the mind of his ſervant; and as he aſſerts nothing but his own deſire, ſo his own deſire is not directly *aſſerted*, in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the term; *firſt*, becauſe every aſſertion may be affirmed to be partly or wholly true or falſe; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe we cannot affirm the truth or falſhood of any ſentence which is formed by the aid of a verb in the imperative mode. A ſentence of this claſs is known to the Perſian Grammarians by the term جملهٔ انشائیه or *A creative ſentence**.

The Perſian Grammarians have divided every ſentence, whether ſimple or complex, into four claſſes. The firſt claſs is termed جملهٔ فعلیه, or THE VERBAL SENTENCE; becauſe the predicate, in this claſs, muſt be always a verb. Example: روز عید آمد و شهر رمضان رفت *The feſtival of the Ede is arrived; and the month of Ramazaun has paſſed away;* &c. The ſecond

* When we ſay to a ſervant, "I deſire you to bring me a glaſs of water," we directly aſſert our own deſire; "My deſire is that you ſhall bring me a glaſs of water" and it might no doubt be impertinent, but it would not be inaccurate, on the part of the ſervant, to reply by admitting the truth of the aſſertion; "I admit your deſire to be ſuch as you have ſtated." This, therefore, is a جملهٔ خبریه; and it conveys *a command*, not directly, but only by implication; that is to ſay, becauſe it is the duty of a ſervant, to accompliſh our deſires, as ſoon as he knows what they are. A true command can only be anſwered by ſtating our intention to reſiſt or to obey it; and hence, it would be abſurd in the ſervant to anſwer "granted" or "I admit the fact" to his maſter who addreſſed him in the imperative mode. I ſhould have thought it unneceſſary to ſay a word on this ſubject, which is ſo clear in itſelf, had it not been affirmed by certain Grammarians, that every ſentence conveys an aſſertion, even though it may be formed by the aid of a verb in the imperative mode.

claſs

class is termed جملهٔ اسمیه, or THE NOMINAL SENTENCE; because the predicate, in this class, must be always a noun. Examples: زید نویسنده است ZYDE *is a writer;* زید خواننده است ZYDE *is a reader; &c.* The third class is termed جملهٔ ظرفیه; because the predicate, in this class, must be a ظرف or NOUN OF TIME OR PLACE; as نزد من فلان کس است *Such a man is near me;* or *with me; &c.* And the fourth class is termed جملهٔ شرطیه or THE CONDITIONAL SENTENCE; because it must be composed of two members; *namely,* the شرط or CONDITIONAL MEMBER; and the جزا which denotes the consequence arising from the شرط. Example: اگر نیت خود نیک داری بی شک مقبول کبریا گردی *If you preserve pure and virtuous intentions, you will certainly be accepted in the sight of* GOD. It must be obvious that this four-fold division is founded, merely, on motives of convenience; and that all sentences are essentially the same in their nature and character; because every sentence must virtually or verbally comprise in itself the three terms of a proposition; however these terms may happen to be expressed.

THE following terms are commonly employed, by the Persian Grammarians, to distinguish the purpose for which a given sentence may happen to occur on a specific occasion.

THIS term is applicable to any given sentence, that may be used to dispel the obscurity or doubt, resting on some other sentence immediately prefixed to it. Thus HAFIZ tells his mistress that "She is rich (in charms;) that he is a proper object of her charity; "and that she must grant the alms due on her beauty," that is to say, "that she must be favourable to him." The following are the lines to which I allude; and the جملهٔ مبینه is comprised in the last proposition which is obviously employed to explain what is meant

meant by the preceding proposition, namely, "granting the alms "due on her beauty."

تو صاحب نعمتی من مستحقم   زکات حسن ده خوش دارم امشب

جملهٔ معترضه

This term is applicable to every parenthetical sentence; that is to say, it is applicable to every sentence, which might be altogether excluded, without injury to the sense of the context. Prayers, whether good or evil, as علیه السلام *On him be peace;* لعنت الله علیه *The curse of* God *be upon him;* &c. must be generally assigned to this class.

EXAMPLE.

مطربی دور ازین خجسته سرا   کس دو بارش ندیده در یکجا

سعدی

"A vile musician (may he never enter this happy dwelling) "who was never seen twice in the same house."

جملهٔ معلله

This term is applicable to every sentence which denotes the cause of a preceding observation.

EXAMPLE.

نباید بستن اندر چیز و کس دل   که دل برداشتن کاریست مشکل

سعدی

"Set not your affections on men and things, for it is not easy "to call them off."

جملهٔ مستأنفه

THIS term it applicable to every ſentence which replies, by anticipation, to a سؤال مقدّر; that is to ſay, to an expected objection, or an expected cenſure, occurring to the mind of the writer himſelf. Thus HAFIZ, having ſpoken much of his attachment to love and wine, anticipates the cenſure of his pious countrymen, and guards againſt it, in the جملهٔ مستأنفه, by having recourſe to the ſhield of predeſtination.

حافظ بخود نپوشید این خرقهٔ می آلود ای شیخ پاکدامن معذور دار ما را

" SPARE your cenſures and hold me guiltleſs, O you, who
" boaſt of ſpotleſs purity; for it is not of his own will, (but
" by the decrees of fate) that HAFIZ has aſſumed theſe wine
" ſtained garments."

جملهٔ نتیجه

THIS term is applicable to every ſentence, compriſing a given deduction, which follows from ſtated preliminary obſervations or facts. Thus سعدی, having aſſigned ſome reaſons why the poor have it not ſo much in their power as the rich to perform the exerciſes preſcribed by religion, proceeds to infer, in the جملهٔ نتیجه, that the devotion of the rich being more perfect, muſt be more acceptable in the ſight of GOD.
پس عبادت ایشان بمحلّ قبول نزدیکتر است که جمع اند و حاضر نه پریشان و پراگنده خاطر .

IT is juſt to ſtate, that the argument with regard to the relative merit of the devotion of the rich and of the poor is carried on between two diſputants; and that the preceding deduction is drawn by one of them, in ſupport of his own theory.

جملهٔ مقطوعه

THIS term is applicable to those unconnected sentences, which detail the contents of a following chapter: as باب اول در سیرت پادشاهان ; باب دوم در اخلاق درویشان ; &c.

جملهٔ حالیه

THIS term is applicable to every sentence, which describes the state of the agent or the object of a verb. Thus a poet, having assumed that he is dead of grief for the unkind usage of his mistress, describes himself, (in the جملهٔ حالیه,) as still filled with commiseration for the state of the living, who suffer under the same tyranny which had been fatal to him.

مُردم و بر زندگانم رحم می آید که تو   خو بآن بیداد و نا داری که با ما کرده

"DEAD as I am, yet I feel commiseration for the state of the "living; since you are still disposed to exercise on others the "same cruelty which you practised on me."

THE hyperbole comprised in these lines is not very uncommon, even in our Language; for we are accustomed to say of a man who has received a fatal wound, (and he may say it of himself) that "He is a dead man." It is true indeed that the wounds of love to which the poet alludes are seldom fatal; but the love of the Persian Poets is generally nothing more or less, in my opinion, than a very ardent species of devotion; however singular the expression of this sentiment, so seemingly inconsistent with the Language of the Poets themselves, may now appear to the European reader.

جملهٔ معطوفه

THIS term is applicable to every sentence which is connected with the preceding by a copulative conjunction. Example:

ارادت

ارادت بیچون یکی را از تخت شاهی فرود آرد و دیگری را در شکم ماهی نگه دارد

" The divine will precipitates one man from his throne; and " preserves another, even in the belly of a whale." A ſentence occurring at the beginning of a diſcourſe is termed جملهٔ ابتدائیّه.

I now proceed to conſider the application of the مفردات or *Single words;* whether NOUNS; VERBS; or PARTICLES; which enter into the compoſition of the Perſian tongue. Among theſe, the pronouns ſhall be firſt noticed, becauſe they have been wholly omitted in treating of inflexion.

مفردات

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS are known, in Perſian Grammar, by the term ضمائر, the plural of ضمیر *A pronoun;* or, literally, *Concealed.* They are ſaid to be *concealed;* becauſe they have invariably a reference to common nouns without which they would be unintelligible. They are thought to be one ſpecies of ſubſtantive nouns; and may be, therefore, accurately diſtinguiſhed by the terms اسمای ضمائر or اسمای مضمر *The concealed nouns;* as oppoſed to an اسم ظاهر; which is a term applicable to common nouns.

A PRONOUN is defined to be *the ſubſtitute of a noun;* from which it follows, that the uſe of either generally (but not invariably as we ſhall ſee in the ſequel) ſupercedes that of the other: or, in other words, that there can be ſeldom any neceſſity for employing both at the ſame time. The pronouns of the firſt, ſecond, and third perſon, are diſtinguiſhed by the terms ضمیر متکلّم; ضمیر مخاطب; and ضمیر غائب; and the noun, to which a given pronoun may happen to refer, is termed its مرجع or *Place of reference.*

The personal pronouns of the Perſian Language are of two kinds; *firſt*, the ضمایر متّصل or conjunctive pronouns; which cannot be uttered when they ſtand alone; and, *ſecondly*, the ضمایر منفصل or disjunctive pronouns; which may be uttered when they ſtand alone. The disjunctive pronouns will be conſidered hereafter; and I now proceed to conſider the conjunctive pronouns of the Perſian tongue.

Among theſe, are commonly reckoned the terminations uſed to vary the inflexions of a Perſian verb; namely, م ; ی ; یم ; ید ; ند; as آمدم ; آمدی ; آمدیم ; آمدید ; آمدند. The third perſon ſingular, as آمد, is ſuppoſed to be deſtitute of any pronoun. If the reader ſhall be diſpoſed to adopt the opinion of thoſe who aſſert the pronominal character of theſe terminations, he may ſupport his theory by certain facts, (ſuch as the repeated omiſſion of م in the following example) which ought, perhaps, to decide the queſtion in his favor.

القصّه باز گشتم و آمد بخانه زود در باز کرد و باز به بست از پس استوار.

انوری

" In ſhort I returned, and ſpeedily reached the houſe; I opened " the door, and afterwards firmly ſhut it again."

It is not probable that the letter م would be omitted after the verbs آمد ، کرد, and بست, which are here uſed for آمدم ; کردم ; and بستم; unleſs that letter were truly a pronoun; and ſo alſo, by analogy, of all the reſt. But as the examples of this kind are of rare occurrence in the Perſian language; and as the preceding pronouns or terminations muſt coaleſce with the verb, in almoſt every example that can be adduced; ſo, it is wholly unneceſſary to conſider their application to the purpoſes of ſpeech; becauſe the uſe of them is obviouſly incapable of illuſtra-

tion by the rules of Grammar.* I proceed, therefore, to a more important claſs of the conjunctive perſonal pronouns of the Perſian Language.

CONJUNCTIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

First Personal Pronoun.		Second Personal Pronoun.		Third Personal Pronoun.	
Singular.	م	*Singular.*	ت	*Singular.*	ش
Plural.	مان	*Plural.*	تان	*Plural.*	شان

These pronouns, with the exception of شان, never repreſent the nominative or the vocative caſe; but they repreſent all the oblique caſes; and may be governed by any given verb or noun, without exception. They ſupply (when uſed in the genetive caſe) the want of poſſeſſive pronouns in the Perſian language; as اسپم *My horſe;* or *The horſe of me;* قلمت *Thy pen;* or *The pen of thee;* زرش *His gold;* or *The gold of him;* &c. And with the exception of a few particles and other words, ſuch as با *With,* بی *Without,* از *From,* در *In,* بہ *In, With,* or *By,* و *And,* یا *Or,* and ſome others; they may be accurately joined to any given word in a ſentence, whether it be a noun, a verb, or a particle.

* The ſame terminations, when employed in the ſenſe of the ſubſtantive verb, are ſuppoſed to be pronouns by many Grammarians: as خادمم *I am a Servant;* خادمی *Thou art a Servant;* خادمیم *We are Servants;* خادمید *Ye are Servants;* خادمند *They are Servants;* &c. But no Grammarian has ventured to aſſign the word است in خادم است *He is a Servant,* to the claſs of pronouns; and I conceive that the terminations in queſtion, when ſo uſed, are connectives of the ſame nature with the word است.

When

When joined to a verb, they are generally, but not invariably, governed by that verb in the objective case: as زدمش *I struck him;* گفتمت *I said to thee; &c.* The following example contains an exception; the words برانگیختم خاطر, being there used for برانگیخت خاطر مرا.

تولای مردان آن پاک بوم برانگیختم خاطر از شام و روم

"My regard for the people of that happy country detached "my heart from Syria and Greece."

In the event of their coalescence with words of any other species, the governing verb or noun will be best determined by consulting the context; but the following rules (such as these are) may possibly be of some aid to the judgment of the learner.

RULE FIRST.

In the event of their coalescence with a verb, they will generally form the first or second object of that verb, as already stated.

EXAMPLE.

خوبی و حسن و لطافت همه دارد اما رحم بر عاشق خود نیست خدایا بدهش
بتنائی

"She is possessed of all beauty, excellence, and grace; but "she has no pity for the pangs of her lovers; may God inspire "her with it."—(خدایا رحم بده اورا)

RULE SECOND.

In the event of their coalescence with the governing noun, they represent, invariably, the genetive case. Examples: اسپم *My horse;* چاکرت *Thy servant;* رفتنش *His going; &c.*

RULE

RULE THIRD.

In the event of their coaleſcence with any other word, in the ſame ſentence, they may alſo repreſent the genetive caſe; and the governing noun muſt be then determined by conſulting the context.

EXAMPLES.

که تا بر فلک ماه و خورشید هست   درین دفترت ذکر جاوید هست

سعدی

"While the Sun and the Moon keep their places in the Hea-"vens, your praiſes (ذکرت) ſhall be preſerved in this volume." (درین دفتر)

نیست اهل ورع آن مانده ز راه   کش بغیر تو کند دیده نگاه

جامی

"That wanderer in the paths of error cannot be numbered "among the truly pious; whoſe eyes (که دیده اش بغیر تو نگاه کند) "are open to the ſight of any thing but thee."

RULE FOURTH.

In the event of their coaleſcence with the accuſative, or firſt object of a tranſitive verb requiring two objects; they will generally form the ſecond object of that verb. Examples: اسپم داد *He gave me a horſe*; زرش بخشیدم *I gave him money*; ناسزایت گفت *He abuſed thee*; &c. &c. &c.

RULE FIFTH.

In the event of their coaleſcence with any adjective that may be uſed to modify the ſenſe of a verb; they will form the firſt or ſecond object of that verb. Examples: سختش زدم *I beat him ſeverely*; بدم آمد *It was unpleaſant to me*; خدا باقیت دارد God *preſerve you*; or God *keep you alive*; &c. &c. &c.

RULE

RULE SIXTH.

In the event of their coalescence with the first component part of a compounded verb; they will generally form the object of that verb.

EXAMPLE.

ای که هرگز فرامشت نکنم   هیچت از بنده یاد می آید

سعدی

" O thou, my creator, who art ever present to my mind; (هرگز ترا فراموش نمی کنم) dost thou ever bestow a thought on me thy creature!"

RULE SEVENTH.

In the event of their coalescence with a particle, as اگر *If*; هرگز *Never*; تا *While*; که *That*; &c. &c. they generally form the first or second object to the verb comprised in that member of the sentence to which they belong. The following are examples of their coalescence with each of these words:—

اگرم حیات بخشی وگرم ممات خواهی   سر بندگی بحکمت بنهم که پادشاهی

" Whether thou grantest me life, or desirest my death, I " submit to thy will; for thou art the Lord."

رشتهٔ سبحه بر انگشت مپیچ   که ازان رشته برون ناید هیچ

تات ازان چشم بود بند و گشاد   هرگزت رو ندهد نقش مراد

جامی

" Twist not your beads about your fingers, for it cannot " possibly be of any use. So long as your devotion proceeds

 " from

"from such a motive; (تا ترا ازان پشم پند وگشاد بود) you "will never attain the object of your wishes." (نقش مراد هرگز ترا روندهد)

هر سو دود آن کش ز در خویش براند

"He who is rejected of God (هر که خدا اورا براند) wanders "about and finds no home."

RULE EIGHTH.

The preceding rule is also applicable in the event of their coalescence with certain other words; such as the demonstrative nouns آن *That*; and این *This*; their derivatives چنان or چنین; the interrogative کدام *Who?* or *What?* its derivative کجا *Where?* or *In what place?* the disjunctive pronoun او *He*; *She*; or *It*; as وکوت (که اورا) وزوت (از او ترا) and (که اورا) &c. &c. &c.

EXAMPLES.

اینش گوید نیست چون تو در وجود در جمال و فضل و در احسان و جود

مولوی معنوی

"He tells him, thou hast no equal in the universe; for "beauty, beneficence, and excellence of every kind."

The Poet is speaking of the Language which a parasite holds to the man whom he desires to flatter.

وگرنه چنانت دهم گوشمال که دانی که هیچم و کمتر ز هیچ

نظامی

"I shall otherwise chastise you in such a manner, (چنان گوشمال ترا دهم) as to convince you that you are nothing, or less than nothing."

گر نزد منی کجات جویم   تا با تو حدیث خویش گویم

سعید حسین .

" If thou art near me, where ſhall I ſeek thee, (ترا کجا جویم)
" that I may inform thee of what I have to ſay ?"

نباشد پادشاهی زوت بهتر   وز آنهم بندگی کن کوت بهتر

نظامی .

" You will find no better prince that he is; (namely, the DEITY)
" ſerve him, for he is the beſt of maſters."

I HAVE not the leaſt doubt that many exceptions to each of the preceding rules may be eaſily diſcovered in the Perſian Language; and after all that can be ſaid on the ſubject, the context will ſtill furniſh the beſt criterion, by which to determine, on every occaſion, the true application of the conjunctive pronouns to the purpoſes of ſpeech.

It only remains to be remarked, that theſe pronouns may ſupply in poetry, (but not in proſe) the place of the word خود; of which the application will be ſhewn hereafter. The following is one example, among many others that might be noticed.

سوی پدرش نظر چو انداخت   از غایت بیخودیش نشناخت

هاتفی .

" So great was her (ſorrow or) confuſion of intellect; that when
" ſhe caſt her eyes on her father, (پدر خود) ſhe did not know him."

THE celebrated LYLEE is the nominative to the verb انداخت; and it is her own father, on whom ſhe is ſaid to have caſt her eyes.

THE

The following rules will ſhew the letters to be rejected or inſerted, on occaſion of the coaleſcence of the conjunctive pronouns with other words.

RULE FIRST.

These pronouns generally coaleſce with other words, by the intervention of the vowel فتحه. Examples: اسپم *My horſe*; چاکرت *Thy ſervant*; رفتنش *His going*; &c. This rule is applicable, even though they may happen to coaleſce with a word which ends in یا following the vowels فتحه or کسره. Examples: نیش *His reed*; نادانیم *My ignorance*; فرزانایش *His knowledge*; میگفتیم *Thou wert ſpeaking to me*; &c.

RULE SECOND.

But after a word ending in های مختفی, or *The gentle aſpirate*; the letter الف muſt be introduced, when the aſpirate follows the vowel فتحه. Examples: خامه ام *My pen*; نامه ات *Thy letter*; جامه اش *His garment*; &c. And if the gentle aſpirate follow the vowel کسره, the letter یا muſt be introduced inſtead of الف. Examples: کی ; کیم ; کیت ; کیش ; چه ; چیم ; چیت ; چیش ; &c. After های مظهر, or *The ſenſible aſpirate*, the pronouns follow the vowel فتحه. Examples: پادشاهم *My prince*; زرهت *Thy armour*; &c. &c.

RULE THIRD.

After every word ending in الف ; or واو معروف ; or واو مجهول ; the letter یا is generally inſerted. Examples: عصایم *My ſtaff*; گیسویت *Thy ringlets*; خویش *His temper*; &c. &c. &c. But the inſertion of this letter, after واو, is not of neceſſary, but of optional obſervance. Examples: بدوم ; ابروت ; گیسوش ; &c.

RULE

RULE FOURTH.

In poetry, theſe pronouns may coaleſce with any verb or noun, not ending in هاى مختفى, by the intervention of the mark سكون; if that mark ſhall happen to be neceſſary to the accuracy of the verſe: as نَگُفْتَمْت, for نَگُفْتَمَت; خَبَرْمَنْش, for خَبَرِ مَنَش; &c. &c. &c. In this caſe the pronouns may follow the letter الف at the end of a word, and the inſertion of the letter يا will not take place.

EXAMPLES.

سَرْو نِشَان اَزْ قَدِ رَعْنَاشْ دَاد گُل خَبَر اَزْ طَلْعَتِ زِيبَاشْ دَاد

جامى

"The cypreſs is an emblem of her graceful form; the roſe is "a ſymbol of her beautiful aſpect."

پِيشِ اُو لُطْف هَمَسَان قَهْر هَمَسَان نُوش دَارُوش هَمَسَان زَهْر هَمَسَان ۰

جامى

"Gentleness and ſeverity, poiſon or its antidote, all are "alike in his eyes!"

The poet is deſcribing the character of an accompliſhed Soofee; whoſe mind muſt be ſo completely abſorbed in the contemplation of the Deity; as to be wholly incapable of deriving pain or pleaſure from any other ſource.

شِعْر بَرَارَد بَاَمِيرِيَت نَام اَلشُّعَرَاءُ اُمَرَاءُ الْكَلَام

نظامى

"By the cultivation of poetry, you will attain eminence; for poets are the moſt eloquent of mankind."

شان   تان   مان

The conjunctive pronouns, in the plural number, are very commonly used in poetry; and seldom or never occur in prose. Of these pronouns, the word شان may be used to form the nominative case; as in the following example from the poet خسرو.

شان در ره و عاشقان بدنبال   خونابه ز دیدگان گشاده

"Behold these ladies walking in the streets; and followed by "their lovers, who are weeping in blood!"

This, however, is a rare occurrence; and generally speaking, the conjunctive pronouns, whether in the plural or in the singular number, will be found to form the genetive or the objective case. When governed by a substantive noun, the conjunctive pronouns, in the plural number, must directly follow that noun; without the intervention of any thing but the کسرهٔ اضافت; or that particle which marks the second of two substantive nouns to be in the genetive case. But even the کسرهٔ اضافت is most commonly, and perhaps most elegantly omitted; as بس که جانها مان طفیل جان تست; in which, مان is connected with جانها, without the intervention of the اضافت, which would be here expressed by the letter یا; as جانهای مان; &c. The application of these pronouns, to the purposes of speech, seems to be unsusceptible of illustration by the rules of Grammar; and I shall only adduce two examples, to shew their occurrence in the genetive and objective cases.

عمرتان باد و مراد ای ساقیان بزم جم   گرچه جام ما نشد پرمی بدوران شما

حافظ

"May your lives be long and happy, O you cup-bearers in the "banquet of Jum! though my cup has not been filled with wine "in your times."

The

THE "Cup-bearers in the banquet of JUM or JUMSHEDE," an ancient king of Persia, is here used to signify "Lovers happy in the presence of their mistresses;" and the poet's complaint, that his cup has not been filled with wine, means that he has failed to obtain the favour of his mistress.

زَبُون گَشْت رُومِی زِ پَیْکَارِشَان   اَجَل خَواسْت کَرْدَن گِرِفْتَارْشَان

نظامی

"THE Grecians were foiled in the contest; and DEATH pre-
"pared to make them his prey."

DISJUNCTIVE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

FIRST PERSONAL PRONOUN.	SECOND PERSONAL PRONOUN.	THIRD PERSONAL PRONOUN.
Nom. Sing. من *I.*	*Nom. Sing.* تو *Thou.*	*Nom. Sing.* وی or او *He, She,* or *It.*
Objec. Sing. مرا *Me,* or *To me*	*Objec. Sing.* ترا *Thee,* or *To thee.*	*Objec. Sing.* ورا ; اورا ; ویرا ; *Him,* or *To him, her,* or *it.*
Nom. Plur. ما *We.*	*Nom. Plur.* شما *You.*	*Nom. Plur.* ایشان *They.*
Objec. Plur. مارا *Us,* or *To us.*	*Objec. Plur.* شمارا *You,* or *To you.*	*Objec. Plur.* ایشان را *Them,* or *To them.*

THE application of these pronouns, to the purposes of speech, cannot be distinguished from that of common nouns. They may form any given case without exception; as مَنْ آمَدَم ; مَا آمَدِیم ; یَارِ تُو ; دِلْدَارِ شُمَا ; اُورَا گُفْتَم ; وَیْرَا دِیدَم ; اَزْ اِیشَان پُرسِیدَم ; &c. &c. &c.
And a second plural is sometimes formed from the first; as مَا ; مَایَان or مَاهَا ; شُمَا ; شُمَایَان or شُمَاهَا ; اِیشَان ; اِیشَانَان or اِیشَانْهَا. I think it doubtful, however, whether the second plural be of classical accuracy; and I am certain, that it is not commonly

commonly ufed by the writers of Perfia; any more than the word اوشان; which is a corruption of the plural ایشان; and of which it would be difficult or impoffible to prove the accuracy, by adducing a fingle example of its occurrence in the works of any Perfian author of eftablifhed reputation*.

The disjunctive pronouns are fometimes found to fupply, in poetry, the place of the reciprocal pronoun خود; as in the following example from the مناجات of نظامی.

ای نظامی پناه پرور تو   بدر کس مرانش از در تو

"O God, of thee Nezaumee feeks protection; do not there-
"fore drive him away." (از در خود او را مران)

The third perfonal pronouns او and وی, and the plural ایشان have been fuppofed by many Grammarians to be invariably applicable to rational beings; unlefs they follow the prepofitions در and بر; in which cafe, they are fuppofed to be common to all animate or inanimate nouns. Now it is true that the third perfonal pronoun is moft commonly applicable to rational beings; yet the examples of its application to the inferior animals, as well as to inanimate objects of every kind, are very numerous; and their accuracy does not feem to have the fmalleft dependence on the prefence or abfence of the prepofitions در and بر. I fhall notice only two examples of this truth, among many others that might be adduced.

* The word ان is faid to have poffeffed formerly the fenfe of the third perfonal pronoun او; but if fo, it has been long obfolete, and is not now of the fmalleft practical ufe. It has been therefore omitted in the lift of pronouns. Since I wrote this note, I have learnt that the pronoun اوشان is frequently ufed in converfation by the Perfians.

چون گرگ بر ایشان زور آوردی آفت ویرا بزخم سرو ازایشان دور کردی

جامی

" WHEN they were attacked by the wolf, he (the bull) would " keep him off with his horns."

زان سر کو گر غباری سوی چشم آید مرا . مردم چشم برون آید باستقبال او

اهلالی

" MY eye balls leap from their fockets to meet the very duft, " which is wafted from the ftreet inhabited by you."

IT is obvious that the pronoun وی, in the firft example, (آفت ویرا) is referred to the *wolf;* and that the pronoun او, in the fecond example, (استقبال او) is applicable to the word غبار *Duft;* yet neither of the prepofitions در and بر have any place in thefe examples; from which it may be inferred, that the application of the pronoun to inferior animals, or to inanimate nouns, has not the leaft dependence on the prefence or the abfence of thefe prepofitions.

IT only remains to be remarked of the perfonal pronouns, that the Poets fome times trefpafs on propriety, by paffing from the plural to the fingular number, or vice verfa; as in the following lines of سعدی.

نگهدار مارا ز راه خطا . خطا در گذار و صوابم نما

" PROTECT us, O GOD, from the paths of error; pardon " our fins, and fhew us (me) the right way."

CHAPTER SECOND.

RECIPROCAL PRONOUNS.

خویشتن خویش خود

These pronouns are exactly ſynonimous; and they corroborate or confirm the meaning of any perſonal pronoun, to which they may happen to be occaſionally ſubjoined. Examples: من خود رفته بودم *I myſelf went*; تو خود رفته بودی; او خود رفته بود; ما خود رفته بودیم; شما خود رفته بودید; ایشان خود رفته بودند; &c. In this, and I believe in every other ſenſe, the pronoun خود is uſed more commonly than either of its ſynonimes خویش or خویشتن. The plural in ها is often added to the pronoun خود by the natives of India; but if this be not improper, (as I believe it is, becauſe I remember no inſtance of its occurrence in the writings of any good author) it is at leaſt unneceſſary; ſince خود is common to both numbers, and to all perſons, as already explained. The caſes, in which a given perſonal pronoun, muſt be ſuperceded by the uſe of the reciprocal pronouns خود, خویش, or خویشتن; (or vice verſa,) may be eaſily diſcovered by the application of the following ſimple rules.

RULE FIRST.

Whenever an Engliſh perſonal or poſſeſſive pronoun (as *thee* or *thy*) ſhall occur in the ſame perſon with another pronoun, (as *thou*) which is the nominative to the verb, compriſed in the ſame propoſition or member of a given ſentence; the place of the perſonal, or the poſſeſſive pronoun, muſt of neceſſity be ſupplied in Perſian by the words خود; خویش; or خویشتن. Examples: من کار خویش میکنم or من کار خود میکنم *I am about my own buſineſs*; من غلام خود را زدم *I have beaten my own ſervant*;

درآمدم من بخانهٔ خود *I entered my own house;* تو کار خود میباشی *Thou art about thy own business;* زدی تو غلام خود را *Thou hast beaten thy own servant;* درآمدی تو بخانهٔ خود *Thou enteredst thy own house;* او کار خود میباشد *He is about his own business;* زدیم ما غلام خود را *We beat our own servant;* درآمدید شما بخانهٔ خود *You entered your own house;* فروختند ایشان اسپ خود *They sold their own horse;* خود را خود کشت *He killed himself; &c. &c. &c.*

RULE SECOND.

But if the two pronouns shall not be of the same person, the word خود must be superceded by the personal pronoun. Examples: زید ترا زد Zyde *beat thee;* اسپ ترا خریدم *I purchased thy horse;* درآمدی تو بخانهٔ من *You entered my house; &c. &c. &c.*

RULE THIRD.

The prevailing usage of the Persian language requires that the word خود should be significant of the *same* person, with that noun or pronoun which is the nominative or agent to a given verb, as already explained in the first rule. But the word خود is not unfrequently applicable to the *object*, and not to the *agent* of a given verb, and, in this case, its application will be ambiguous, if it shall not be illustrated by the use of the conjunctive personal pronouns. Examples: زید را در خانهٔ خودش دیدم و دیدی و دید عمر *I saw*, or *Thou sawest*, or Amr *saw* Zyde *in* his *own house;* مرا در خانهٔ خودم دیدی و دید عمر *Thou sawest*, or Amr *saw me in* my *own house;* ترا در خانهٔ خودت دیدم و دید عمر *I saw* or Amr *saw thee in* thy *own house.* Let the conjunctive pronouns be here omitted, and it will be doubtful, in my opinion, whether the pronoun خود be applicable to the *agent*, or to the *object* of the verb. Example: زید را در خانهٔ خود دیدم *I saw* Zyde *in my* (or perhaps in *his*) *own house.* Let the verb نشسته be inserted after the word خود; as زید را در خانهٔ خود نشسته دیدم *I saw* Zyde

sitting

sitting in his (or perhaps in *my*) *own house*; and the ambiguity, even in that case, will not be entirely banished; but the probability will, as I conceive, be in favor of its application to the object of the verb دیدم. The reason seems to be this; that ZYDE is at once the *object* of the verb دیدم; and the *agent* or *nominative* to the verb نشسته; and if the sentence were thus rendered زیدرا دیدم که در خانهٔ خود نشسته بود *I saw* ZYDE *sitting in his own house*; it would then consist of two members; and the application of the pronoun خود would be no longer doubtful.

RULE FOURTH.

THE third personal pronoun ش, may be optionally added to the word خود; whenever that word is applicable to the third person. Examples: خودش آمد *He himself is come*; خودش گفت *He himself said so*; &c. And all the conjunctive pronouns may be added to the word خود, (as they are added to any other word) when they form the oblique, or the objective case. Example: از افعال خودم شرم می آید for از افعال خود مرا شرم می آید *I am ashamed of my own actions*; &c. &c. &c.

CHAPTER THIRD.

اسمای اشاره

OR

DEMONSTRATIVE NOUNS.

اسم اشارهٔ بعید			اسم اشارهٔ قریب		
Sing. Nom.	آن	*That.*	*Sing. Nom.*	این	*This.*
Sing. Objec.	آنرا بدان	*That*, or *To that.*	*Sing. Objec.*	این را بدین	*This*, or *To this.*
Plur. Nom.	آنان آنها	*Those.*	*Plur. Nom.*	اینان اینها	*These.*
Plur. Objec.	آنهارا بدانها	*Those*, or *To those.*	*Plur. Objec.*	بدینان اینهارا بدینها	*These*, or *To these.*

The demonstrative nouns are ſaid to be diſtinguiſhed from the pronouns, *firſt*, becauſe they cannot generally ſupercede the uſe of the مشار اليه or *Noun pointed out;* with which, on the contrary, they commonly coaleſce: as آن مرد *That man;* اين زن *This woman; &c.* and, *ſecondly*, becauſe they are ſaid to be reſtricted, in their primitive acceptation, to material and ſenſible objects; in oppoſition to *pronouns*, which are ſuppoſed to be applicable in their primitive acceptation, to all objects of the underſtanding, as well as of the ſenſes.

But neither of theſe definitions appears to me to convey a clear idea of the true nature of demonſtrative nouns; and the laſt ſeems to be wholly nugatory, *firſt*, becauſe demonſtrative nouns are now more commonly applicable to abſtracted ideas than pronouns themſelves; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe it is probable that both were reſtricted, in their primitive acceptation, to the objects of ſenſe.

I am diſpoſed to believe that the demonſtrative nouns are truly ſubſtantive nouns; and, if not pronouns in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the term, they approach very nearly, in their nature, to the pronominal character. For a pronoun has been defined to be *the ſubſtitute of a noun;* and the demonſtrative nouns are, in my opinion, the true *ſubſtitutes* of thoſe nouns by which they are commonly followed; as آن مرد *That man;* اين زن *This woman; &c. &c. &c.* There are two arguments againſt the accuracy of this definition; both which I ſhall endeavour to ſtate, and to anſwer, as well as I am able; leaving the reader to form his own judgment, when the queſtion to be conſidered ſhall be fully before him.

Firſt, it may be contended, that the uſe of a pronoun ought to ſupercede the uſe of the common ſubſtantive noun, of which its office is to ſupply the place; *ſecondly*, that the third perſonal

pronoun *he*, does, accordingly, supercede the use of any given substantive noun, as *John* or *James*, *&c.* which it may happen to represent on a given occasion; *thirdly*, that the demonstrative nouns cannot generally supercede the use of the مُشَارٌ اِلَيْهِ to which they refer; (the insertion of both being indispensibly necessary in most cases;) and, *finally*, that the demonstrative nouns cannot, therefore, be truly pronouns, in the strict and proper sense of the term.

Or it may be contended, *first*, that a pronoun is the true substitute of a common noun; *secondly*, that every pronoun ought, therefore, to represent the very same idea signified by a given substantive noun for which it stands; *thirdly*, that the third personal pronoun *he*, does, accordingly, represent the very same idea signified by any given substantive noun, as *John* or *James*, *&c.* of which it may be employed to supply the place; *fourthly*, that the demonstrative nouns have a demonstrative sense peculiar to themselves, which does not belong to the مُشَارٌ اِلَيْهِ; and, *finally*, that the demonstrative nouns cannot therefore be truly pronouns; because a pronoun has *no sense*, but that of the noun of which it may be used to supply the place.

It is to be observed, however, that the use of a personal pronoun cannot always supercede the use of the common substantive noun, of which it is generally employed to supply the place; and, on the contrary, it would be easy to adduce many examples, in which the insertion of both is indispensibly necessary to the full comprehension of a given sentence; as in the case of a royal proclamation, beginning *We* George the third *by the Grace of* God, *King of Great Britain; &c. &c.* and other examples of the same nature. Let the pronoun be omitted in this example, and it will be obviously impossible to determine whether his Majesty, or any of his servants, be in fact the speaker; because the noun will assume the third person: (George the third orders and ordains) Let the noun be omitted, (we order and ordain) and there

will

will be nothing to which we can refer the pronoun *we*. In the one cafe it may be afked whether HIS MAJESTY or fomebody elfe be the *fpeaker* of the proclamation; in the other cafe it might be afked who is meant by the pronoun *we*. And this is equally true, not only of the written, but alfo of the oral communication of fuch a proclamation; fuppofing the fpeaker and the hearer to have no perfonal or previous acquaintance with each other.

IT may be inferred, therefore, that the firft perfonal pronoun (*I*) has, in fact, a fenfe peculiar to itfelf; for though it approaches very nearly to the fenfe of the word SPEAKER of which it may be faid to fupply the place; it is very eafily diftinguifhed from that word in the manner of its application; *firft*, becaufe a man muft be himfelf the fpeaker of his own fentiments, before he can employ the pronoun *I*; (I am of opinion that fo and fo is the cafe) and *fecondly*, becaufe he may employ the word *fpeaker*, in relating the fentiments of another man. (The fpeaker is of opinion that fo and fo is the cafe, &c.)

IT is obvious, therefore, that the extended application of the word *fpeaker* is greatly reftricted by the pronoun *I*; or, in other words, that the pronoun *I* conveys the whole fenfe of the word *fpeaker*, together with a *new idea* or piece of information, which cannot be conveyed by that word. Now the exiftence, in the perfonal pronouns, of this new idea, which is peculiar to themfelves, may be a very good reafon for banifhing the ufe of the term *pronoun* from the fcience of Grammar; but fo long as that term fhall be applied to the *perfonal nouns* of a given language, two of which have doubtlefs a fenfe peculiar to themfelves, there can be no reafon, why it may not be alfo applied to the demonftrative nouns of the fame language, which have alfo a fenfe peculiar to themfelves*.

FOR

* The fenfe of the firft perfonal pronoun (*I*) cannot be fully conveyed by the fubftantive noun for which it ftands; and hence, it muft be abfurd to maintain that this pronoun has no fenfe

For the existence, in certain personal nouns or pronouns, of a given sense, which is peculiar to themselves, is indeed the true principle that must be assumed before we can account for the necessary insertion of a pronoun, followed by the common substantive noun to which it refers; as *We* GEORGE THE THIRD, *King of Great Britain*; *&c. &c. &c.* This follows obviously from the following consideration; *namely*, that the insertion of the pronoun cannot be necessary to convey the *same* information which is conveyed by the noun. But if the pronoun shall convey (as we know to be the fact) a piece of information which is peculiar to itself, then doubtless, the insertion of both may be often necessary to the full comprehension of a given sentence; *first*, because the pronoun cannot be intelligible, if unaccompanied by the common substantive noun to which it refers; and, *secondly*, because the common substantive noun cannot convey that information which is peculiar to the pronoun.

It follows from the preceding observations, *first*, that certain personal pronouns have in fact, a sense peculiar to themselves; *secondly*, that this is the reason why a personal pronoun must be often followed by the common substantive noun to which it

---

sense but that of the word of which it may be employed to supply the place. The pronoun *I* is therefore *something more* than a mere pronoun; for this obvious reason, that it conveys *something more* than the sense of any given substantive noun which it may happen to represent on a given occasion. This consideration has induced one of my friends, who is engaged like myself in Grammatical pursuits, to reject the use of the term *pronoun*; and to substitute instead of it, the term *personal nouns.* I have no quarrel with the term *pronoun*; and merely mean to observe in the text, that both the personal and the demonstrative nouns or pronouns have clearly a sense peculiar to themselves. Now this sense which is peculiar to themselves must be often expressed in a given sentence; and as it cannot possibly be expressed, otherwise than by the insertion of the personal or the demonstrative nouns or pronouns, so these must be often accompanied by the common nouns to which they refer; because without these they would be unintelligible. The necessary insertion of the مُشَارٌ إِلَيْهِ after a given demonstrative noun, as *that book* or *this letter,* does not therefore, furnish any convincing proof that the demonstrative noun is not the *substitute* of the مُشَارٌ إِلَيْهِ; just as the necessary insertion of the common noun after any personal pronoun (*I John Grant* or *I James Grant, &c*) does not furnish any convincing proof, that the first personal pronoun is not, in these examples, the *substitute* of the following substantive nouns.

refers;

refers; *thirdly*, that the demonſtrative ſenſe, which is doubtleſs peculiar to the demonſtrative nouns, will furniſh no ſufficient reaſon for excluding theſe noun from the claſs of pronouns; and *finally*, that the general inſertion of the مُشَارٌ اِلَيهِ may be accounted for (as in the caſe of *We* GEORGE THE THIRD, *&c.*) on principles perfectly conſiſtent with the pronominal character of the demonſtrative nouns.

HAVING premiſed theſe obſervations, I now proceed to ſtate the circumſtance on which the *nominal*, or *pronominal* character of the demonſtrative nouns ſeems to depend; leaving the reader to adopt either of the two opinions to be ſtated by me, which ſhall be moſt conſonant to the dictates of his own judgment. Every demonſtrative noun muſt be a ſubſtantive or an adjective by its own nature; and if it be truly an adjective, the inſertion of the مُشَارٌ اِلَيهِ, or *following ſubſtantive noun*, will be invariably neceſſary to complete the conſtruction of a given ſentence; *firſt*, becauſe the demonſtrative adjective will denote the exiſtence of a demonſtrative ſenſe in the following object or ſubſtantive noun; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe it thence follows that the ſubſtantive muſt be underſtood, if it be not expreſſed, in every ſentence. And if the demonſtrative nouns be truly ſubſtantive nouns, they muſt be the pronominal names of the مُشَارٌ اِلَيهِ; but as the latter may be any one, among an infinite number of objects which the mind of man is able to conceive, as *a book; a man; a horſe; &c.* ſo, it will be generally neceſſary, in this caſe, to ſpecify or define the مُشَارٌ اِلَيهِ to which we allude on a given occaſion, by the inſertion of the common ſubſtantive noun. It appears, therefore, that whether the demonſtratives آن *That* and اِين *This* be truly adjective or truly ſubſtantive nouns, the general inſertion of the مُشَارٌ اِلَيهِ will be equally neceſſary in either caſe.

To explain by an example. If the word *that* be truly an adjective, it then denotes the exiſtence of a demonſtrative ſenſe in

the following substantive noun; as *book; letter; pen; &c.* which must be understood, if it be not expressed. And in this case the word *that* cannot be assigned to the class of pronouns; because it will be utterly impossible to establish any distinction between it, and any other simple adjective noun. But if the word *that* be truly a substantive, it must be the pronominal name of the مُشَارٌ اِلَيهِ; and the construction exhibited in the words *this book*, and *that letter*, will not be that of an adjective followed by a substantive noun, but that of two substantive nouns, (one of them being a pronoun) of which the second is employed to dispel the obscurity which hangs on the first; as *This book*, or *This, namely the book, is very amusing; That letter*, or *That, namely the letter, is full of entertainment;* &c. &c. This last construction corresponds, exactly, with that of the pronoun *we*, followed by its noun of reference GEORGE THE THIRD.

IN point of practical utility, it is a matter of little importance which of these opinions the reader may happen to adopt; since the application of the demonstrative nouns, to the purposes of speech, will be exactly the same in either case. I presume, however, that those who hastily yield to first impressions will be less willing to admit the pronominal character of the demonstrative nouns, than those who shall consider the subject with deeper attention*. I now proceed to detail the rules, which guide and restrict the application of the demonstrative nouns to the purposes of speech.

RULE FIRST.

THE اِسْمِ اِشَارَه, being accompanied by the common sub-

* When we speak of *a good man*, we mean to affirm that the attribute *goodness* exists in the man, or belongs to him. When we speak of *this* or *that man*, we certainly do not mean to affirm that the demonstrative sense exists in the man, or belongs to him; because the demonstrative sense cannot possibly be the attribute of any man. It appears to me, therefore, that the demonstratives cannot be truly adjectives; or, in other words, that they are substantive nouns.

stantive

ſtantive noun to which it refers, muſt precede and cannot follow that noun; as آن کتاب *That book;* این جهان *This world;* &c. It muſt, in this caſe, invariably preſerve the ſingular number; even though the مشار اليه ſhall aſſume the plural number. Examples: آن مردان *Thoſe men;* این زنان *Theſe women;* آن چیزها *Thoſe things;* این چیزها *Theſe things;* &c. (In other words, the اسم اشاره is never put into the plural number, when *followed* by the common ſubſtantive noun to which it refers.)

RULE SECOND.

If the اسم اشاره ſhall be applicable to a given ſubſtantive noun, expreſſed or underſtood or gathered from ſome part of the ſentence, it muſt generally agree in number with that ſubſtantive noun; aſſuming either form of the plural in آن or ها, according to the animate or inanimate character of the ſubſtantive noun.

EXAMPLE.

شراب لعل کش و روی مه جبینان بین خلاف مذهب آنان جمال ایشان بین

حافظ

" Enjoy the pleaſures of wine, indulge in the contemplation " of female beauty; deſpiſing the creed of auſtere devotees, de- " vote yourſelf to the contemplation of female beauty."

I have not been able to tranſlate this paſſage literally; but the reader will eaſily perceive, that the word ایشان is applicable to مه جبینان, with which it agrees in the plural number; and that the word آنان refers to زاهدان *the devotees,* which is not expreſſed, but merely gathered from the context. The devotees are the continual objects of the poetical enmity of Hafiz, and of all the Soofees; a circumſtance, however, which does not

imply

imply (as it has been supposed to do) any want of reverence, on the part of the SOOFEES, for that religon which they were taught to believe.

RULE THIRD.

IF the اسم اشاره shall be applicable to various nouns connected together by means of conjunctions, it will generally preserve the singular number; provided (but not otherwise) that these nouns shall be of the singular number and of the inanimate class.

EXAMPLE.

شاهد آن نیست که دارد خط سبز و لب لعل   شاهد آنست که این دارد و آنی دارد

سلمان

I CANNOT easily translate these verses; and it will be sufficient to state, that the rule refers to the preservation of the singular number in the word این; which is applicable to خط سبز و لب لعل. Had these nouns been of the animate class; the demonstrative, on general principles, must have assumed the plural number.

RULE FOURTH.

IF the اسم اشاره shall be applicable to the sense of a preceding, or a following sentence; it must preserve the singular number.

EXAMPLES.

غم خسرو همی دانی و نادان میکنی خودرا   مرا این سوخت ورنه طعنهٔ دشمن نمی‌سوزد

" You know, and yet pretend ignorance, of the misery of
" KHOSRO; it is *this* which consumes me; not the censure of
" my enemies, which I am able to bear."

خسروا

خسروا هیچ ندانم که چه طاعت بود این   روی در کعبه و دل سوی بتان ختنست

" I KNOW not, O KHOSRO, what sort of devotion is *this* of " yours: your face, it is true, is directed to the Kaaba; but your " heart is devoted to the damsels of KHOOTAN."

RULE FIFTH.

THE word آن , when followed by the indefinite یای مجهول, denotes *a certain undefinable elegance and gracefulness of form and manner;* and in this sense, it is very often used by the Persian poets; as بنده طلعت آن باش که آنی دارد *Devote yourself to her who is possessed of grace; &c.* The junction of the demonstrative nouns, by a copulative conjunction denotes *every thing;* because there is nothing in the world, to which the relations of *proximity* and *distance* are not applicable. Example: من فکر این و آن ندارم *I have no thought of any thing;* that is to say, *of every thing; &c.*

RULE SIXTH.

WHEN the demonstrative nouns follow certain prepositions and other words, such as بر , در , از , که, &c. the primary الف is generally rejected; after transferring its vowel point to the preceding letter. Examples: دران ؛ درین ؛ بران ؛ برین ؛ کان ؛ کزین &c. And the letter ن of the demonstrative این is changed into م before the words شب ؛ روز ؛ and سال ؛ as امروز *To day;* امشب *To night;* and امسال *The present year; &c.*

CHAPTER FOURTH.

اسم موصول

OR

THE RELATIVE PRONOUN.

THE following observations on the nature of the RELATIVE PRONOUN are extracted from the Grammatical Treatise in the ENCYCLOPŒDIA BRITANNICA.

In order to determine with precision the nature and import of the relative pronoun, it will be necessary to ascertain the powers which it contains, or the parts of speech into which it is capable of being resolved. Now it is obvious, that there is not a single noun, or prepositive pronoun, which the relative is not capable of representing: for we say, I, WHO *saw him yesterday*, cannot be mistaken; YOU, WHO *did not see him* may have been misinformed; THEY, WHO *neither saw nor heard*, can know nothing of the matter; THE THINGS, WHICH *he exhibited were wonderful*. From these examples, it is apparent, in the first place, that the relative contains in itself the force of any other pronoun; but it contains something more.

If from any sentence in which there is a relative, that relative be taken away, and the prepositive pronoun, which it represents, be substituted in its stead, the sentence will lose its bond of union, and stand quite loose and unconnected. Thus, if instead of saying *the man is wise* WHO *speaks little*, we should say *the man is wise* HE *speaks little*, the sentence would be resolved into two; and what is affirmed of the man's *wisdom*, would have no connexion with the circumstance of his *speaking little*. HENCE it is evident, in the second place, that the *relative* contains the force of a *connective*, as well as of the *prepositive* pronoun. What kind of connexion it denotes, is next to be ascertained.

It may be laid down as a general principle, that, by means of the relative pronoun, *a clause of a sentence*, in which there is a verb, is converted into the *nature of an adjective*, and made to denote some *attribute* of a *substance*, or some *property* or *circumstance* belonging to the *antecedent noun*. Thus, when it is said, *homo qui prudentia præditus est*, the relative clause *qui prudentia præditus est*, expresses nothing more than the *quality* of prudence in *concrete* with the *subject homo*, which might have been equally well expressed by the adjective *prudens*. In like manner, WHEN WE say, *vir sapit qui pauca loquitur*, the relative clause expresses

the property of *speaking little* as belonging to the man, and as being that quality which constitutes, or from which WE infer, his *wisdom;* but if there were such a word as *pauciloquens,* that quality might very properly be expressed by it, and the phrase *vir sapit pauciloquens* would express the same assertion with *vir sapit qui pauca loquitur.*

Now if a relative clause expresses that which might be expressed by an adjective, the presumption is, that it may be resolved into the same constituent parts. But every adjective contains the powers of an *abstract substantive,* together with an expression of connexion; and may be resolved into the *genetive case* of that substantive, or into the *nominative* with the particle *of* prefixed; which, in ENGLISH, corresponds to the termination of the genetive in the ancient languages. That the member of a sentence, in which there is a relative, may, in every instance, be analysed in the same manner, will be apparent from the following examples:—*Vir qui sapit, vir sapiens,* and *vir sapientiæ;* a man who is wise, a wise man, and a man of wisdom; are certainly phrases of the same import. AGAIN, *homo, cui ingratus est animus, malus sit amicus,* may be translated into English, "the ungrateful man, or the man of ingratitude is a bad friend."

THUS then it appears, that the *relative pronoun* contains in itself the force of the *prepositive pronoun,* together with that *connexion* implied in English by the preposition *of,* and in the ancient languages by the *genetive case.* WHEN one says, *vir sapit qui pauca loquitur,* the relative clause *qui pauca loquitur* expresses that attribute of the man from which his wisdom is inferred: it is conceived by the mind, as stript of its propositional form, and standing in the place of a substantive noun governed in the genetive case by *vir.* The whole sentence might be thus translated, "the man *of little speaking* is wise;" or, did the use of the English language admit of it, "the man *of he speaks little* is wise." In like manner, when it is said, "MAN who is born of woman is of few

days

days and full of trouble;" the relative clause is equivalent to an *abstract noun* in the genetive case, and the whole might be expressed in the following manner, " man *of he is born of a woman* is of few days and full of trouble."

The preceding observations on the nature of the relative pronoun appear to me to be perfectly accurate; and if they shall be fully understood, the reader will not be much surprised to learn, that there is not, properly speaking, any such thing as a relative pronoun in the Persian language. For if it be true, that " every relative pronoun unites in itself the force of *a connective*, followed by *the antecedent*, or *its pronominal name*," it is obvious, that the absence of all relatives might be easily supplied, in a given language, *by employing the necessary connective, followed by the antecedent*, or *its pronominal name*.

This plan has been accordingly adopted in the Persian language; and the word کہ, which has been termed by Grammarians the اِسمِ مَوصُول, is, in truth, a SIMPLE CONNECTIVE; belonging, as I conceive, to the class of PARTICLES; and not to the class of nouns or pronouns. This connective cannot, however, be translated by the English OF; and it seems to me, to have a much nearer affinity to the word THAT; when this word is used in the sense, which has induced Mr. HARRIS to give it a place among the class of conjunctions; as " Thieves rise by " night, that they may cut men's throats," &c. &c. &c. It is true, indeed, that Mr. TOOKE denies the existence of the conjunction THAT; which he has resolved into a demonstrative noun, in every example that can be adduced: as, " Thieves may cut men's " throats; for *that* (purpose) they rise at night," &c. &c. But though it may be true, that the English conjunction is the same word, that is to say, that it denotes *the same idea*, signified by the English demonstrative noun; (and we know that both are represented by the same *sound*, namely, by the sound of the word *that*) it is nevertheless certain, that the DEMONSTRATIVE, and the

CONJUNCTION,

CONJUNCTION, are wholly unconnected in the Perſian language. The demonſtrative ان *That*, can never ſupply the place of the conjunction که; nor can the conjunction که *That*, ſupply the place of the demonſtrative ان.

I REPEAT, therefore, that the words که and چه, (for چه is alſo a relative) which are improperly conſidered as nouns by the Perſian Grammarians, are *ſimple connectives*; and conſequently *particles*; correſponding, in point of ſenſe, with the conjunction *that*. And hence it happens, that the recurrence of the antecedent or its pronominal name, in the relative clauſe of a given ſentence, is ſometimes optional; as ادب آموز از آن ادیب که او ادب از حضرت خدا آموخت "Learn purity of manners and conduct, from that maſter, "who (*that he*) acquired purity from the DEITY himſelf;" and ſometimes neceſſary; as نهان کی ماند آن رازی کز آن سازند محفلها "How can that ſecret remain concealed, which is the ſubject of "converſation, or of which they ſpeak, (or *that of it* they ſpeak) "in every company."

IT will be the object of the following rules, to aſcertain the uſe and application of the words که and چه, when theſe words are employed as a bond of union, to connect the relative clauſe of a given ſentence with its proper antecedent; and, in order that the rules may be fully underſtood, it is neceſſary to remark, *firſt*, that the antecedent is termed the موصوف موصول; or *that ſubſtantive, to which the relative clauſe of a given ſentence is imputed in the form of an attributive; ſecondly*, that the connective که or چه, is termed اسم موصول or *the relative noun*; *thirdly*, that the member of the ſentence to which it belongs, is termed the صله or *attributive*; and, *finally*, that the predicate, which is indiſpenſibly neceſſary to complete the ſenſe of the ſentence, is termed, as uſual, مسند.

RULE

RULE FIRST.

THE word كه may occur after any antecedent without exception; as هركه ; آنكه ; منكه ; توكه ; مردكه ; زنكه ; دلكه ; &c. &c. &c. But if it occur *directly* after the word هر (that is to say, if the substantive noun shall not be expressed, (as هر چيز كه *Every thing which)* it will be restricted, in its application, to rational beings: as هركه *Every man or woman who;* but not, *Every thing which; &c. &c. &c.* In every other case, the word كه is common to all nouns of the animate or inanimate class.

RULE SECOND.

THE antecedent to the relative كه, admits the optional insertion of the letter ياى مجهول; which seems to bestow on it a definitive sense, like that of the words آن *That* or هر *Every;* as دليكه or آن دلكه or هر دلكه *Every heart which; &c. &c.* It also admits the insertion of the prepositions, and of the termination را; as اوراكه ; مراكه ; بمنكه ; بدلكه : or it may be followed by an adjective noun, or a compound epithet; as من مخمور از يار كه &c. &c. &c.

RULE THIRD.

THE relative چه is commonly restricted, in its application, to inanimate nouns; but some few instances of the contrary might be adduced; as هرچه درويشانند ايشان را وامى بده "Those who are "poor lend them money;" هرچه توانگرانند از ايشان چيزى بخواه "Those who are rich, ask them for something;" &c. &c. The antecedent to the word چه is generally or invariably one or other of the following words: آن ; هر ; چندان ; as آنچه *That which;* چندانچه *How much soever;* هرچه *Whatsoever; &c.* It may be questioned whether the word چنانچه *As,* or *So that,* can be accurately

accurately assigned to the class of relatives. The relative چه is sometimes followed by که; as آنچه که *That which; &c. &c.* but the superfluous insertion of the particle که is at least inelegant, perhaps inaccurate; and seems to be generally avoided by the best authors.

RULE FOURTH.

The antecedent is some times elegantly omitted in Persian poetry; as چه باشد میسّر بزودی فرست "Whatever is prepared, send "it quickly;" in which, چه is obviously used for هرچه. So also, the اسم موصول is sometimes omitted after the words هر and کجا; as

هرکس بکعبهٔ طلبت رو نهد نخست   از کل کائنات کند قطع التفات

(or هرکس که) "He who directs his attention to the pursuit of thee, "must begin by banishing from his mind every other object;" هرکجا سلطان عشق آمده (or هرکجا که) "Wherever the mighty sovereign "of love makes his appearance;" *&c. &c.* The antecedent may be also omitted before کجا; as کجا for هرکجا in the following example from the poet ازرقی.

کجا ز همت عالیش یاد خواهی کرد   بچشم عقل نماید ستاره اندر چاه

"The stars, with all their height, seem to the eye of reason to "be at the bottom of a well, when compared with the height of "his magnanimity."

By an elipsis, the word کرا or هرکرا, may be also used for هرکه اورا; as کرا سیم و زر باشد و گنج و مال "To whom there is, or "whosoever possesses gold and silver, wealth and treasure;" &c. &c. It is scarcely necessary to remark that the مسند, or *Predicate of the proposition*, sometimes precedes the antecedent or subject; as ای مبارک ساعتی که دیدیم "Happy is the hour in which you

"saw

"ſaw me:" but generally ſpeaking it ought to follow it, and the reverſed order is more common in poetry than it is in proſe.

RULE FIFTH.

IF the اسم موصول be a ſimple *connective*, and conſequently a *particle*, as I have endeavoured to eſtabliſh; it follows that it will be wholly unſuſceptible of variation by gender, number, caſe and perſon. Accordingly the اسم موصول is, in fact, unſuſceptible of ſuch variation, except in the ſingle caſe of the elipſis adverted to in the preceding rule: namely, هركرا for هركه اورا. Every example, to be adduced in the ſubſequent rules will be found to confirm the accuracy of this obſervation.

RULE SIXTH.

IT has already been remarked, that every ſentence in which there is a relative pronoun muſt compriſe in itſelf an *antecedent*, which is generally the *ſubject* of the propoſition; a *relative clauſe*, which is aſcribed to the ſubject, in the form of an *attributive;* and *a predicate* or مسند به; without which the ſentence cannot convey a perfect ſenſe. Now if the ſame antecedent ſhall be at once the *nominative* to the verb compriſed in the relative clauſe of a given ſentence, and the *nominative* to the verb compriſed in the predicate or مسند به of the ſame ſentence, the inſertion of the antecedent will be ſufficient for every purpoſe of perſpicuity; and the recurrence of its pronominal name will be generally avoided, as well in the predicate, as in the relative clauſe. Example: هركه بيند روى تو معذور فرمايد مرا "Whoever ſees your face, "will pardon me." It would be awkward, in this caſe, to repeat the antecedent by inſerting its pronoun; (هركه او بيند, &c.) yet it may, nevertheleſs, be optionally repeated; though the examples of its repetition are not very numerous in all probability*.

RULE

* Of its repetition, in the relative clauſe, the following example may however be adduced:

هركه

RULE SEVENTH.

If the ſame antecedent ſhall be at once the *accuſative* or *object* to both verbs, the recurrence of its pronominal name will generally depend on the omiſſion or inſertion of the termination را , which marks the accuſative or objective caſe. If the termination را ſhall follow the antecedent, the pronominal name will ſeldom recur. Example: آنرا که بخواند بدرکس ندواند "God does not ſend the "man whom he ſelects, or calls to himſelf, to wander about from "door to door." In this example, it is obvious that the antecedent آنرا, is at once the accuſative or object to both verbs; and the termination را being here inſerted, the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent is therefore avoided. Let the termination را be omitted, and the antecedent or its pronominal name will moſt commonly recur; but it will be optional with the ſpeaker to expreſs it in either clauſe of the propoſition, and perhaps, in many caſes, to omit it entirely. Examples: کسیکه اورا میخوانم بدرکس نمی دوانم ; or کسیکه میخوانم بدرکس نمی دوانم اورا or کسی که میخوانم بدرکس نمی دوانم ; &c. &c.

If there be any ſuch thing as a general rule, to guide the judgment of the learner in the omiſſion or inſertion of the pronominal name of the antecedent in ſuch examples as theſe, it muſt be the following; *namely*, that the pronominal name of the antecedent muſt be *inſerted* whenever its omiſſion would be detrimental to

---

هرکه او از همزبانی شد جدا   بی نوا شد گرچه دارد صد نوا

"The man who is ſeparated from his friend is poor in the midſt of affluence."

And of its repetition, in the predicate of the propoſition, the following example will ſuffice:

هرکه در راحت و تنعّم زیست   او چه داند که حال گرسنه چیست

"He who lives in luxury and eaſe, how can *he* judge of the ſtate of the hungry!"

the

the perſpicuity of the ſentence; and that it ought to be *omitted* in every other caſe. Now the words كسيكه مي خواند بدر كس نمي دواند would be obviouſly obſcure; becauſe it is uncertain whether the word كس be the *agent*, or the *object*, of both verbs. Inſert the termination, (كسي را كه مي خواند) and the obſcurity will ceaſe; or let the perſon of the verbs be changed (كسي كه مي خوانم) and it will ceaſe likewiſe. I conceive, therefore, that the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent cannot be neceſſary in either of theſe caſes; and that it *is* neceſſary; whenever my underſtanding tells me, that its omiſſion would be detrimental to the perſpecuity of a ſentence.

RULE EIGHTH.

If the ſame antecedent ſhall be the ظرف to both verbs, the recurrence of its pronominal name will be generally avoided. Before I adduce an example, to illuſtrate the operation of this rule, I think it neceſſary to recall to the reader's mind the meaning of the term ظرف; which has, however, been already explained. The term ظرف is applicable to *all* nouns which indicate the name of any portion of time or ſpace; as وقت; or شب; روز; or جاي; &c. &c. &c. The prepoſition which ought to govern ſuch nouns is very generally omitted; as روز قيامت *On the day of judgment*; وقت نماز *At the time of prayer*; &c. &c. The following example will illuſtrate the operation of the eighth rule.

آن دم كه بدم جوان و مويم شبه رنگ　　صد حور بدي بدامنم در زده چنگ

وين دم كه شدم پير و برخ بر زده رنگ　　از من زن و فرزند همي دارد ننگ

"When I was young and handſome, a hundred damſels "ſought my love; but now that I am old and wrinkled, my wife "and children are aſhamed of my appearance."

In this, as in every other caſe, the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent is unqueſtionably optional; as دو ميكه دران دم جوان بودم &c. &c.

RULE NINTH.

If the ſame antecedent ſhall be the *nominative* to the verb comprifed in the *relative clauſe* of a given ſentence, and the *accuſative* or *object* to the verb comprifed in the *predicate* or مسند به of the ſame ſentence; the recurrence of its pronominal name will be generally avoided; but its inſertion will yet be optional to every ſpeaker. In the event of its inſertion, it will, however, be generally reſerved for the predicate of the propoſition; and will be ſeldom repeated in the relative clauſe. Example: آنکه زر ندارد بهیچ شمارندش "He who has no money, "they (mankind) account him as nothing." The pronominal name of the antecedent, which is here inſerted in the predicate of the propoſition, is wholly omitted in the following example:

دل که طومار وفا بود من محزون را پاره کردند ندانسته بتان مضمون را

آصفی

"My afflicted heart, which was a volume of conſtancy, they "have torn in pieces; ignorant of its contents."

RULE TENTH.

If the ſame antecedent ſhall be the *accuſative* or *object* to the verb comprifed in the *relative clauſe* of a given ſentence, and the *agent* or *nominative* to the verb comprifed in the *predicate* or مسند به of the ſame ſentence; the recurrence of its pronominal name, in either clauſe of the ſentence, (that is to ſay, in the relative clauſe, or in the مسند به) will generally depend on the omiſſion or inſertion of the particle را after the antecedent. If the particle را ſhall be omitted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will generally occur in the relative clauſe. Example: هر کس که او را طامع بینی طالب خیر نیست "The man whom you per- "ceive to be avaricious, is not deſirous to practiſe virtue." And in the event of its inſertion, the pronominal name of the antecedent

will

will be generally omitted; as هر کرا طامع پیشی طالب خیر نیست . Yet there is no obscurity in the words هر که طامع پیشه باشد طالب خیر نیست, which are consequently accurate; notwithstanding the omission of the termination را; and hence it may be inferred, that the insertion of the pronominal name of a given antecedent is never necessary, but for the purpose of dispelling some doubt or obscurity, which its omission might tend to create in the sentence. In the event of its insertion, it may occur in either clause of the proposition according to the option of every speaker; as هر کرا طامع پیشی او طالب خیر نیست; &c. &c.

RULE ELEVENTH.

If the same antecedent shall be the *nominative* to the verb comprised in the *relative clause* of a given sentence, and the فاعل to the verb comprised in the *predicate* or مسند به of the same sentence; the recurrence of its pronominal name, in either clause of the sentence, will generally depend on the omission or insertion of a preposition before the antecedent. If the preposition shall be inserted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will seldom recur. Example: در سرای دنیا که بقا ندارد و آرام نباید کرد: "Rest not in this world which is transitory." And if it shall be omitted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will generally recur in the predicate of the proposition, as in the following example: سرای دنیا که بقا ندارد درو آرام نباید کرد "The habitation of the "world which is transitory; rest not in it." But the following example will shew, that the omission of the preposition before the antecedent, is not always followed by the insertion of its pronominal name in either clause of a given sentence:

زمانه می شکند خار غصه در جگرم دمیکه بی رخ آن گلعذار می گذرد

خواجه عصمت

"I SUFFER the utmost rage of fortune, during every instant of "of my absence from the woman I love."

I HAVE

I HAVE not been able to tranflate thefe lines literally; but it is obvious that the *predicate*, or مسند به, is here comprifed in the firft line; and that the fecond contains the antecedent together with the relative claufe. The fenfe of the verfe might be thus rendered: دو وقت یار در مفارقت آن کاینده بار می گذرد ودرآن وقت زمانه خار غم در جگرم می شکند and the infertion of the words درآن وقت is optional only, but not neceffary; fince the fenfe of the fentence would be fufficiently perfpicuous, though thefe words were taken away.

RULE TWELFTH.

IF the fame antecedent fhall be the ظرف to the verb comprifed in the *relative claufe* of a given propofition, and the nominative to the verb comprifed in the *predicate*, or مسند به of the fame propofition; the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent will generally depend on the infertion or omiffion of a prepofition before the antecedent. If the prepofition fhall be inferted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will feldom recur in either claufe; as در شهری که عدل نباشد عجب است که ویران نشود "In a city where juftice is not adminiftered, it will be "furprifing if it does not go to decay." If the prepofition fhall be omitted, the pronominal name of the antecedent will generally recur in the relative claufe. Examples: شهری که درو عدل نباشد عجب است که ویران نشود. But many examples of its omiffion might be found or made: as ساعتی که مرا دیدی مبارک است; &c. &c.

RULE THIRTEENTH.

IF the fame antecedent fhall be the *accufative* or *object* to the verb comprifed in the *relative claufe* of a given fentence, and the ظرف to the verb comprifed in the *predicate* or مسند به of the fame fentence; the prepofition applicable to the ظرف will be generally expreffed before the antecedent, and the pronominal name will feldom recur in either claufe. Example:

 بجائی

بخانه که ساختم در آمدم " I entered the houſe which I built;" or if this order ſhall be reverſed, the ſame rule will be ſtill applicable. Example: بهر حالی که باشی غنیمت دان " Be ſatisfied " with your condition, whatever it may be." But the recurrence of the pronominal name of the antecedent will be doubtleſs optional in either caſe. Examples: بخانه که آن را ساختم در آمدم; بهر حالی که باشی آن را غنیمت دان; &c. &c. &c.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

It often happens that the antecedent to a relative pronoun is *indirectly* connected with the verb compriſed in the *relative clauſe* of a given ſentence, by the intervention of another ſubſtantive noun. In this caſe, the pronominal name of the antecedent *muſt* be of neceſſity inſerted in the relative clauſe. The following is an example. دل آزاری که بیمارم ز چشم نامسلمانش " A tormenting beauty, of " whoſe infidel eyes I have felt the force". It is obvious that the introduction of the word چشم, which here forms the bond of union between the *antecedent* and the *verb* compriſed in the relative clauſe, renders the inſertion of the pronominal name of the antecedent (دل آزاری که از چشمش بیمارم) indiſpenſably neceſſary in that clauſe. There are very few exceptions to this rule in the Perſian language.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

It often happens that the antecedent to a relative pronoun is *indirectly* connected with the verb compriſed in the *predicate* of a given propoſition, by the intervention of another ſubſtantive noun. In this caſe, the pronominal name of the antecedent *muſt* be inſerted in the predicate of the propoſition; and the ſentence will exhibit a form of conſtruction, which ſeems (for what reaſon I cannot tell) to be generally proſcribed in our language. Example: بخلافی که درین باب از حکما منقول است وجهش اینم " The oppoſition
" of

" of opinion stated to have subsisted among the philosophers on this " subject; the circumstances of it (namely, *of that opposition*) are " these"*. This sentence is perfectly accurate according to the structure of the Persian language; though the construction, exhibited in my translation, may not be idiomatical in our tongue. The letters of Abool Fuzl abound in similar examples: as

هرگونه صورت دل‌پذیر که در تخیل ضمیر مخفی بود خوشتر
ازان بر منصهٔ ظهور جلوه نما شد

" Every admirable plan, which I meditated in my mind, was " more than executed." (صورتی خوشتر ازان صورت جلوه نما شد)

It must be admitted, however, (though not in this instance) that Abool Fuzl often sets at defiance the plainest rules of Grammatical science; and the use which he makes of the relative pronoun, in the following example, will furnish one specimen, among many others that might be adduced.

ونیز از مکنونات خاطر حق پرست آن بود که حاکم تهته را که غربی ممالکت
روز افزون بر ساحل دریای شور است وبر زیر دستان آن مرز بوم راه
معدلت نمی سپرد نصایح هوش افزای فرموده به شاهراه فرمان برداری
ره نمون گردد

" I had also determined to admonish, and lead to my obedience, the ruler of T'hatta; which (country) is situated on " the shores of the ocean, to the west of my own dominions; " and which (ruler) governs not his subjects, according to the " principles of justice."

I believe that this reference of the relative pronoun, in the first place, to the *country*; and, in the second place, to the *ruler*; must be considered as reprehensible, according to all the rules of rational Grammar.

* Here the word خلاف which is the antecedent, is connected with the verb است, (which is *understood* in the predicate) merely by the intervention of the word وجه.

RULE

RULE SIXTEENTH.

In a given sentence, of which the first part contains an antecedent followed by a relative pronoun, the predicate of the proposition will be frequently omitted; and its place will be supplied by another sentence, from which the true predicate may be accurately and easily inferred.

EXAMPLE.

هرکه از غیر تو شد بیگانه   ورع این است و دگر افسانه

جامی

"Whoever has estranged himself from every thing but thee;
" this only is piety, and every thing else is vain mockery."

The demonstative noun این *This*, is here applicable to the sense of the relative clause of the sentence; namely بیگانگی از غیر خدا " Estrangement from every thing but God;" and the true predicate of the proposition (namely در زمرهٔ ورع پیشگان داخل است, or any other words to the same effect) is omitted, to make way for the definition of piety contained in the second line. The following is another example of the same nature; and many more might be easily adduced.

حسابی که فرموده رای باشد   کس از پیش بینی نیابد گزند

نظامی

" Your observations on this subject (مستحسن است *are*
" *excellent*,) for no one will ever suffer by the practise of a
" prudent foresight."

RULE SEVENTEENTH.

It appears from the preceding rules, that the pronominal name of the antecedent is sometimes inserted in the relative clause

clauſe of a given propoſition; and ſometimes inſerted in the predicate, or مُسْنَدٌ بِه of the ſame propoſition. The following example will ſhew that it may be accurately introduced into both.

یا رب این نوگل خندان که سپردی بمنش می سپارم بتو از دست حسود چمنش

حافظ

I LEAVE the reader to tranſlate theſe verſes, of which the ſenſe will be eaſily underſtood; and ſhall only obſerve that the pronominal name of the antecedent, which is repreſented by the third perſonal pronoun ش, occurs in *each* member of the ſentence, as the accuſative or objective to the verb سپردن.

RULE EIGHTEENTH.

THE pronominal name of the antecedent may be ſuperceded by the recurrence of the proper antecedent; or of any deſcriptive epithet which is applicable to it.

EXAMPLE.

ارسطو که دستور درگاه بود بهر نیک و بد محرم شاه بود

سکندر بتدبیر دانا وزیر بکم روزگاری شد آفاق گیر

نظامی

" ARISTOTLE, who was his chief miniſter, and the confidant " of all his ſecrets; ALEXANDER by the management of that " able miniſter (namely ARISTOTLE) ſoon became a great " conqueror."

IN this example the words دانا وزیر are obviouſly applicable to ARISTOTLE; whoſe proper name or pronominal name (سکندر بتدبیر ارسطو or سکندر بتدبیرش) might ſupercede theſe words, without injury to the ſenſe of the ſentence.

 IT

It only remains to be remarked, that whether the antecedent to a relative pronoun ſhall be a common ſubſtantive noun, or a pronoun in the firſt, ſecond, or third perſons; the rules for its omiſſion or inſertion, in the predicate, or in the relative clauſe of a given propoſition, are, in all caſes, preciſely the ſame. Thus, the firſt perſonal pronoun, being the antecedent, is repeated in the relative clauſe of the following ſentence: منکه در پیش من چه خاک وچه سیم "I who hold dirt and ſilver "in equal eſtimation;" &c. &c. and its repetition is not merely optional, but neceſſary; becauſe it is *indirectly* connected with the verb underſtood in the relative clauſe of the propoſition, by the intervention of the word پیش *The front*; which is a ſubſtantive noun of the claſs termed ظروف as already explained.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

اسماء الاستفهام

OR

INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS.

The following account of the interrogative pronouns is extracted from the Grammatical Treatiſe in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA.

"We have ſaid that the interrogative pronouns, as they are called, *who*, *which*, *what*, are intimately connected with *relatives*; we now affirm, that the *two firſt* of theſe words are *nothing* but relatives, and that the *laſt* contains in itſelf the united powers of a *relative* and *definitive*. With reſpect to *caſes*, *number*, and *gender*, the words *who* and *which*, when employed as *interrogatives*, differ not from the ſame words when employed as *relatives*; and we hold it as a maxim, without which ſcience could not be applied to the ſubject of language, that the *ſame word* has always the ſame *radical import* in whatever different ſituations

it

it may be placed *. To understand this, it is necessary to observe, that all men have a natural propensity to communicate their thoughts in the fewest words possible: hence it follows, that words are often omitted which are necessary to complete the construction of the sentence; and this no where happens more frequently than in the use of *who* and *which*. In sentences where *these words are confessedly* RELATIVES, *we often find them without* an antecedent; as,

"*Who* steals my purse, steals trash,"—SHAKESPEARE.

"Which *who* would learn, as soon may tell the sands."—DRYDEN.

"Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Mævi."—VIRG.

That is, "*He* who steals my purse, &c." "which *he* who would learn, as soon &c." and "Ille *qui Bavium non odit*, &c." Such abbreviations occasion no obscurity, because from previous circumstances the hearer knows the mind of the speaker and the persons to whom he refers. But it is not with respect to the *relative* and *antecedent* only that such abbreviations have place: in sentences of a different form, whole clauses are sometimes omitted, while the meaning of the speaker is made sufficiently plain. Thus when KING RICHARD III, having lost his horse in battle, exclaims, "A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!" there is no complete thought *expressed*; but the circumstances in which the King then was, enabled those about him to understand that he *wanted a horse*. Accordingly CATESBY answers him, "Withdraw, my Lord, I'll help you to a horse."

* THIS mischievous maxim would be alone sufficient, in my opinion, to prevent for ever the progress to perfection of grammatical science. For it amounts to an assertion that *two ideas are never represented, in a given language, by the same sound*; than which (notwithstanding the high authority of Mr. TOOKE, and of those who have adopted it on his authority) nothing can be more erroneous in point of fact; or more untenable by the force of reason. I believe, with the writer on the Encyclopædia, that the word *who* is truly a relative pronoun, even when employed to ask a question; and the reasons, on which my belief is founded, are detailed with great perspicuity in the dissertation in the text which I have borrowed from him. But if his maxim be just, there is an end to the necessity for any farther arguments on the subject; for we know that the interrogative and the relative are both expressed by the same word or sound; *namely*, by the sound of the word *who*; from which it follows, according to that maxim, that the idea signified by both is and must be of necessity the same. So, also, a Taylor's bill should be a bird's bill, since both are signified by the word *bill*; or a box in the ear should be a chest of wood, since both are signified by the word *box*.

IN like manner, when a person asks a question, his expression is frequently incomplete; but the tone of his voice, or some other circumstance, enables us to ascertain his meaning, and to supply if we please, the words that are omitted. Thus when it is said, *An fecisti?* nothing more is *expressed* than, *If you did it* (the Latin *an* being nothing else but the Greek ἂν *si*); but some circumstance enables the person who hears it to know that the meaning is "say if you did it." Let us apply these observations to the words *who* and *which*. If these words be *relatives*, and if our analysis of the relative be just, it is obvious, that no *complete* meaning can be contained in the clause, "who is your principal friend?" for that clause contains nothing more than the circumstance of *being your principal friend* predicated of some *unknown* person; "of he is your principal friend." That this is indeed the case, every man may be convinced, by asking himself what he means by the interrogative *who* in such a sentence? for he will find it *impossible to affix to it* ANY *meaning without supplying an antecedent clause*, by which that which is *called* an *interrogative* will be immediately converted into the *relative pronoun*. The custom, however, of language, and the tone of voice with which the *relative clause* is uttered, intimates, without the help of the *antecedent*, the wish of the speaker to be informed by the person addressed of the name and designation of his principal friend; and we know that the sentence when completed is, "*Tell me the name and designation of the person* who is your principal friend." Again, when the prophet says, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?" he utters but *part* of a sentence, which when completed will run thus: "*Describe the person* who cometh from Edom (this is that *person*) with dyed garments from Bozrah." He *sees* a person coming from Edom, of whose name and designation he is ignorant, he calls upon some one for information concerning these particulars; and that there may be no mistake, he describes the unknown person as having *dyed garments from Bozrah*; but lest even that de-

scription

scription should not be sufficiently accurate, he throws in the definitive clause, *this is that person*, pointing at him, we may suppose, with his finger. *Which*, used as an interrogative, indicates a wish of knowing a particular person or thing out of more than one mentioned; as, "which of the two did it?" that is, "*Tell me the one* of the two which did it," for in old English *which* as a *relative* is often used, where in modern English we should say *who;* and that mode of speech is still retained when the antecedent is omitted, and the relative clause employed to indicate such a wish as that before us. *What* includes in itself the signification of a *definitive* and a *relative pronoun;* as, "from "*what* has gone before, *what* follows may easily be guessed;" where the word *what* is equivalent to *that which*. When therefore we say, "what rude fellow is that?" our meaning is, "*De-*"*scribe* that *person* who is that rude fellow." Upon the whole, then, it is evident, that the words called *interrogatives* are merely *relative pronouns;* and that interrogative *sentences* are *relative clauses* uttered in such circumstances as to enable the hearer to supply the antecedents necessary to complete the meaning.

* * * * *

If the preceding observations be founded in truth, it should seem to follow, as a matter of necessity, that *every interrogative* in a given language may be accurately employed as a *relative* in the same language. For if those pronouns, which we call interrogative, be truly and of necessity relative pronouns; there can be no reason, why any one of them may not be employed as a relative; that is to say, in its true and proper sense. Now we know that the interrogative pronouns of our language are in fact employed as relative pronouns; nor can it be denied, that the same observation is very generally applicable to the interrogative pronouns of other tongues.

It is probable, therefore, that relative pronouns do, in many languages, supply the absence of interrogative pronouns; or,

in other words, that there is not in the Engliſh, (and ſo alſo of many other tongues) any ſuch thing as an interrogative, contradiſtinguiſhed from a relative pronoun. The ability of moſt interrogatives, in every language, to aſſume the ſenſe of relative pronouns, will fairly juſtify this inference; but it does not follow of any given claſs of nouns, that becauſe they have no exiſtence in one language, therefore they can have no exiſtence in another tongue. On the contrary, it would be eaſy to prove (ſee the اِسْم ظَرْف and the اِسْم آلَه of the Arabic language,) that the ſame claſs of nouns, which is familiar to the ſtructure of one language, is often wholly unknown to many others; and hence it follows, that the abſence in the Engliſh, or in any other language, of interrogative as contradiſtinguiſhed from relative pronouns, can be no proof of their abſence from every tongue.

The exiſtence or non-exiſtence of ſuch pronouns, in any given language, muſt be therefore determined by adverting to facts; and theſe will ſoon decide the queſtion, ſince we need not look beyond the Perſian language, in order to diſcover an interrogative pronoun (namely the word كُدَام *Who? What?* or *Which?)* that cannot be uſed in a relative ſenſe. The exiſtence of this pronoun, which admits of no antecedent, becauſe it is never uſed in a relative ſenſe, ſeems to me to overthrow at once, the arguments of thoſe who would ſupply an antecedent to every interrogative, becauſe "it is impoſſible to affix to the latter any "meaning, without ſupplying an antecedent clauſe:" and I cannot therefore believe, that the propoſition كُدَام كَس اَسْت اِين *Who is this man?* is in any reſpect leſs perfect or complete, than the ſame propoſition, expreſſed in any other poſſible way.

It is true indeed, that we may ſupply an antecedent in the Engliſh language: as "Tell me the name or profeſſion of him who is "this man" but the preſpicuity of the ſentence will not be encreaſed, but greatly diminiſhed, by the inſertion of the antecedent;

dent; since it is wholly owing to the relative character of the pronoun *who*, that we are here at liberty to supply an antecedent. For if that pronoun were deprived of its relative character, it would not, as an Interrogative, admit an antecedent; nor can the antecedent be supplied in the Persian Language, where the proposition is formed by means of the Interrogative کدام, which cannot be employed as a relative pronoun.

It follows from these observations, that the words called interrogative are not *of necessity* relative pronouns; though it is most probably true, that relative pronouns do, in the English, and in many other tongues, supply the absence of interrogative pronouns. But if there be any such thing as an Interrogative, contradistinguished from a Relative pronoun, it must be intelligible without reference to any antecedent: *first*, because we know that the antecedent to such a pronoun cannot be supplied; and *secondly*, because that which cannot be supplied, is never wanting to the perfection of a given proposition. Let it now be admitted that every interrogative can be resolved into an antecedent followed by a relative pronoun; as "Who is your principal "friend," or "Tell me the name of him who is your principal "friend;" and, supposing the word *who* to be truly interrogative, and not relative in this example; it will thence follow, that the interrogative *who* contains in itself the force of *the antecedent*, and of the relative *who*. But "him who is your principal friend," does not form a perfect interrogative sentence; and whatever is wanting to the perfection of the sentence, *that*, also, must be comprised in the interrogative *who*.

For we know that a single word (as yes or no) may comprise in itself the force of a whole proposition; (I admit the fact, or I deny the inference;) and hence it follows, that we need not hesitate to assert the existence, in a true interrogative pronoun, of every thing necessary to its perfection, as the first member of an interrogative sentence. To conclude. The existence or non-

existence

existence of interrogative, as contradistinguished from relative pronouns, is a matter to be determined by adverting to facts; and the fact of their existence being established in the case of the Persian words كدام *who? what?* or *which?* كي *when?* چون *how?* كو *where?* &c. &c. there is at once an end to the argument; and we have nothing more to do, but merely to discover the true resolution of an interrogative sentence; and to affirm, in the pronoun, the existence of every thing which is necessary to the perfection of the sentence; that is to say, *to its intelligible character, as an interrogative pronoun.*

The interrogative pronouns of the Persian language amount to the number of nine; but of these there is one, namely ان *How many?* which is now seldom or never used. Of the rest I shall proceed to treat in their order; having first premised, that the observations which I am enabled to offer on the use and application of interrogative pronouns, are of little importance in my own eyes. In point of fact, there is nothing to distinguish the application of these pronouns, from that of common substantive nouns; and all that can be said on the subject, will be common to the corresponding parts of speech in every tongue. That the reader may understand the following rules, it is necessary to remark, that the subject of enquiry is termed, in Persian Grammar, مسئول عنه; or مستفهم عنه; and sometimes, simply مضاف اليه; because it is supposed to be governed by the interrogative pronoun, in the genetive case.

چه ANCIENTLY چي

Who? What? or Which?

RULE FIRST.

This pronoun still retains the letter ي in the word چيست; and drops the last letter in its conjunction with any other word: as چگونه ; چرا ; چسان &c. It is common to all nouns whether animate

animate or not; as چه کس است ; چه چیز است ; چه گونه ; چه حال داری &c. &c. But if the مسئول عنه, or *following substantive noun*, shall not be expressed; it is generally or invariably restricted in its application to inanimate nouns. Example: پیش تو چیست *What is before you?* چه می گوید *What does he say?* &c. It admits of the inanimate form of the plural number; as کس نمیداند که با زید بیچاره چها کرده اند و می کنند "No body knows how "they have treated, and how they continue to treat the unfortu-"nate Zyde." (N. B. The word چه is clearly interrogative, not relative, in this example.)

RULE SECOND.

When followed by the termination را, it corresponds in point of sense, with the word *why?* that is to say, it demands the *reason* or *cause* of a given effect. Examples: چرا آمدی *Why did you come?* چرا رفتی *Why did you go?* &c. It cannot therefore be followed by the termination را, when it forms the object to a transitive verb. Examples: چه گفتی (not چرا گفتی) *What did you say?* چه کردی (not چرا کردی) *What did you do?* &c. But چه, as well as چرا, is sometimes used by the poets to signify *why?*

EXAMPLE.

ای که با مدعیان کار تو لطف و کرم است   در حق اهل محبت چه جفا و ستم است

" O thou who art favorable even to thy enemies; why " (چرا) art thou cruel to those who love thee!"

RULE THIRD.

The word چه, like other substantive nouns, may be governed by nouns, verbs, and particles; that is to say, it may be accurately put into any given case without exception. Exam-

 ples:

ples: این کس است چه *Who is this man?* این شراب چه چیز است *Of what is this wine made?* چه کردی *What have you done?* از چه سبب رنجیده شدی *Why are you vexed?* &c. &c. &c. In the genetive case, it is, however, most commonly superceded by the word کدام; as این شراب کدام چیز است *Of what is this wine made?* &c. &c.

* * * * *

It is usual among the Persian Grammarians to illustrate, by many examples, the *rhetorical application* of interrogative pronouns. Now it appears to me, that this application is nearly the same in every language; yet the reader may not be displeased to peruse the following examples, among many others that might be adduced.

First. The word چه is employed to form the استفهام انکاری, or that sort of interrogative, by which a speaker means, in reality, to deny the proposition comprised in the مسئول عنه. Example: بر در می خانه حرف خانقه ای شیخ چیست "Who talks of a "temple at the door of a tavern?" that is to say, *No man can be guilty of such an absurdity.*

Secondly. It is employed to form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to express his admiration of the مسئول عنه.

EXAMPLE.

این چه منزل چه بهشت این چه مقام است اینجا
عیش باقی لب ساقی می و جام است اینجا

"What a heavenly habitation is this, which unites the "pleasures of love and wine!"

Thirdly.

Thirdly. It may form that fort of interrogation, by which the fpeaker means to exprefs his earneft defire, that the perfon addreffed fhall be prevailed on to comply with a given requifition.

EXAMPLE.

چه باشد گر شبی پرسی که در شبهای تنهایی
غریبی زیر دیوارت چه گونه می کشد شبها

"O! If you would condefcend to enquire into the ftate of a "poor ftranger, paffing his tedious and folitary nights, under "the walls of your habitation!"

Fourthly. It may form that fort of interrogation, by which the fpeaker means to force the affent of his hearer to the truth of a given propofition.

EXAMPLE.

گر من نه غرق آتش و آبم ز دست تو
این سینهٔ آتش و چشم پر آب چیست

"If I fuffer not, through your means, all the miferies of "fire and water; what mean thefe, my ftreaming eyes and "burning breaft!"

Fifthly. It may form that fort of interrogation, which implies the contempt of the fpeaker for the actions or fentiments of a given individual. Example: زید چه خوب کاری ساخت *How finely* (that is to fay, *How ill*) Zyde *has managed on this occafion!*

Sixthly. It may form that fort of interrogation, by which the fpeaker means to affert the equality, or deny the difference, between two or more objects or events. Example:
چه بر تخت مردن چه بر روی خاک.

Seventhly.

Seventhly. It may be employed in detailing the ſubordinate ſpecies, compriſed in a given generic noun. Example: دو صد مفرش ز دیبای گرامی چه مصری و چه رومی و چه شامی "Two hun-"dred carpets of the fineſt brocade; whether of Syrian, Gre-"cian, or Egyptian manufacture."

Eighthly. It may be, and very often is, prefixed to that member of a ſentence which defines the cauſe of a preceding obſervation. Example: عاقل باید که بدنیا دل ننهد چه دنیا ناپایدارست و اعتماد بقا را نشاید "A wiſe man ought not to ſet his affections on this world; "why? becauſe the world is tranſitory, and paſſeth away." The word چه is clearly interrogative in this example; and muſt be therefore uttered with that tone of voice which is ſuited to a queſtion. There is an obvious pauſe before and after the word چه, which ſtands, as it were, completely aloof from either of the preceding or following propoſitons. I muſt requeſt the readers particular attention to this application of the interrogative pronoun; becauſe the examples of its occurrence are very numerous in the Perſian language.

It would be eaſy to add many other examples of the rhetorical application of the pronoun چه; but the preceding are ſufficient for every purpoſe of practical utility, ſince the nature of the reſt may be eaſily inferred from the conſideration of the examples already adduced. I ſhall therefore now proceed to illuſtrate, by a very few examples, the uſe and application of the pronoun كه.

كه ANCIENTLY کی *Who?*

RULE FIRST.

This pronoun ſtill retains the letter ی, in the word کیست; and drops the laſt letter in the word کرا. It is entirely reſtricted in its application to rational beings; and therefore admits of none but

but the animate form of the plural number in ان; as ایشان کیستند "Who are they?" &c. &c. It cannot, like the word چه, be followed by the مضافٌ الیه; for though چه کس است is perfectly accurate; که کس است would be abſolute nonſenſe. It may be governed by nouns, verbs, and particles; that is to ſay, it may form any given caſe without exception. Examples: که گفت "Who ſaid ſo?" فلان کیست "Who is that?" فلان چاکر که باشد "Whoſe "ſervant may that be?" کرا دادی "To whom did you give it?" کرا زدی "Whom did you beat?" از که شنیدی "From whom "did you hear this?" &c. &c.

RULE SECOND.

The rhetorical application of the pronoun که is nearly the ſame with that of the pronoun چه; and I ſhall therefore notice only one example, in which both pronouns are emphatically uſed together, in order to add to the emphaſis and force of the queſtion.

قالب تو رومی و دل زنگی است　　رو که نه این شیوه یکرنگی است
با تن رومی دل زنگی که چه　　رنگ یکی گیر و دو رنگی که چه
جامی

These verſes cannot be eaſily tranſlated; but the poet, in the firſt line, means to contraſt the external form, with the mind or diſpoſition of his miſtreſs. The firſt is declared to be Grecian, for its beauty; the ſecond to be Ethiopian, which indicates cruelty. "Go then," proceeds the poet "for this is not well; what has the "form of a Grecian to do with the ſoul of an Ethiop?" The laſt line contains an admonition to his miſtreſs, to endeavour at the attainment of uniform excellence, in mind as well as in form; (رنگ یکی گیر) and then proceeds to aſk, "what ſhe "can propoſe to herſelf, in maintaining the contraſt between her "form and her mind?" This appears to me to be the meaning of

the words دو رنگی که چه; and it is obvious that the coalescence of the words که and چه, in the third, as well as in the fourth line, is meant merely to add force and emphasis to the question; which would be rendered in common language by the word چیست.

کدام *Who? What?* or *Which?*

RULE.

This pronoun (sometimes written کدامی or کدامین) is common to all nouns whether animate or not; and being almost invariably followed by the مسئول عنه, as کدام چیز است ؛ کدام کس است &c. &c. it seldom or never admits of the plural number in either form. Like the other pronouns of the same class, it may be governed by nouns, verbs, and particles; that is to say, it may form any given case without exception: as فلان برادر کدام کس است "Whose bro-"ther is that?" بکدام کس گفته بودی "To whom did you say so?" &c. Its rhetorical application is nearly the same with that of the pronouns که and چه; and it sometimes follows the word هر as هر کدام کار که می فرمائی در انجام آن حاضرم "Whatever you order me to "do, that I will do." Even in this case, the word کدام is clearly interrogative; and forms, in conjunction with the word کار, the antecedent to the relative clause of the sentence. The construction is the same as if it were said in English, "Every *what* "that you shall order, *that* I will do."

چون *How?*

This pronoun is equivalent, in point of sense, to the words چگونه *In what state?* or *In what manner?* as چونی در فراق یار "How are you "in the absence of your friend?" درین جا چون رسیدی "How did "you arrive here?" &c. Its proper application admits of no illustration by the rules of grammar; and I shall merely observe, on this subject, that it sometimes (though rarely) supplies the place of

of the pronouns چه *What?* or چرا *Why?* as چه کنم or چون کنم "How, or what shall I do?" چون زدی آن را or چرا زدی فلان را "How came you to beat, or Why did you beat that man?" &c. Of its rhetorical application many examples might be adduced; but as these are common to the corresponding part of speech in other tongues, I shall merely insert the following; in which the interrogative چون marks the impressive nature of the event comprised in the مسئول عنه:

بهرام را تا چون گرفته این زمان گور بین

"BEHOLD BAHRAUM, how he is now swallowed up in the grave!"

کی *When?*

THE application of this word admits of no illustration by the rules of grammar; and I shall merely remark, that it may be occasionally governed by two or three prepositions; though the insertion of these seems to be optional only, but not necessary. Examples: کی رفتی واز کی رفتی "When did you go? or How long have you been gone?" کی خواهی رفت وتا بکی خواهی رفت واز کی خواهی رفت "When shall you go?" &c. &c. &c.

OF its rhetorical application there are many examples, but the following gingle (in which the reiteration of the pronoun denotes the earnest desire, entertained by the speaker, for the arrival of that period of time, in which he shall enjoy the united pleasures of love,, music, and wine,) will here suffice.

کی باشد وکی باشد وکی باشد وکی من باشم ووی باشد ومی باشد ونی

کجا *Where?* or *Whither?*

I CONCEIVE this word to be an obvious contraction for کدام جای "What

" What place?" It may be governed by the prepositions از , تا , or بہ; and also by the word ہر *Every*; as تا کجا or بکجا " Whether? " or To what place?" از کجا " Whence? or From what place?" ہر کجا " Wheresoever;" &c. The insertion of the preposition از, before the word کجا, seems to be necessary; but the other prepositions are most commonly omitted. Examples: از کجا می آئی " Whence do you come?" تا کجا می روی or کجا می روی " Where are you going?" &c. &c.

The rhetorical application of the word کجا is of very common occurrence in the Persian language; but the following are the only examples of this kind, that need be adduced. First. It may form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to mark the opposition existing between two or more objects, wholly dissimilar in their own nature. Example: حسب ال زہد کجا نشاۂ شراب کجا " It is one thing to practise piety, and another to indulge in " the pleasures of wine." Secondly. It may form that sort of interrogation, by which the speaker means to express his impatience, at the long continuance of the event comprised in the مسئول عنہ. Example: تا کجا مرا پریشان داری " How long will you con- " tinue to render me miserable?" &c. &c. &c.

کو *Where?*

THIS word is nearly synonymous with the word کجا; but the examples of its occurrence are much less numerous in the Persian language. It never follows the prepositions از, تا, or بہ; nor is it commonly used, like the word کجا in the strict and proper interrogative sense. On the contrary, its application is generally rhetorical; though some examples of the true interrogative application might be found or made: as زید کو " Where is ZYDE?" عمر کو " Where is AMR?" &c. &c. I believe this word to be almost exclusively in the possession of the poets; and of its rhetorical application

plication by them, the following example, in which it forms the استفهام انکاری as already explained, will here suffice.

بگیرم که مار چوبه کند تن چوشکل مار کو زهر بهر دشمن وکو مهره بهر دوست

خاقانی

" I GRANT that the *Maurchoba* may twist its body into the " form of a snake; but where shall it find the poison with which " to destroy its enemies; the jewel with which to reward its " friends?"*

چند *How many ?*

THIS word may be governed by nouns, verbs, and particles; that is to say, it may form any given case without exception: as چند اسپ داری " How many horses have you?" بچند میفروشی " For how much will you sell it?" &c. &c. &c. It is said, that the answer to the word چند according to its primitive acceptation, ought not to be less than three or more than ten; but this fact I conceive to be doubtful, because there is no such restriction in the present application of that word. The word چند is not invariably interrogative: on the contrary it very often assumes an informative sense; as چند کیسه زر دارم " I have so many purses " of money;" چند کتاب خریده ام " I have purchased a few " books;" &c. &c. In either of these cases, it may be followed by the demonstrative nouns, which seem to bestow on it a superlative sense; as چندان جست وجوی خواهی کرد " How long will

* The مار چوبه is a species of grass, so called, because it resembles a snake. Now the snake is supposed, like Shakespear's toad " ugly and venemous " to wear " a precious jewel in his head;" and this jewel is signified by the word مهره in the second line. The poet is speaking of those writers of his own time, who presumed to imitate the productions of his pen; and their ill success is compared to that of the مار چوبه; which, says he, may doubtless twist its body into the form of a snake, but cannot attain the essential properties of that reptile; being utterly destitute of poison with which to destroy its enemies, and of jewels with which to reward its friends.

"you seek it?" چندان مال دارم "I have a great deal of "money;" چندین بار او را گفتم "How often have I told him;" or "I have told him very often;" &c. The rhetorical application of this word is nearly the same with that of the other interrogative pronouns; and does not therefore stand in need of any illustration.

To the preceding interrogatives, the particle آیا is commonly added; but there is little to be said of this particle, which is invariably interrogative, and cannot be used to form the vocative case. Like other interrogatives, it must govern a complete and perfect sentence; and cannot be followed by a single noun: as آیا زید ایستاده است یا عمر "Is Zyde or Amr standing there?" آیا زید آمده است "Is Zyde come?" آیا زید این جا نیست "Is not Zyde here?" &c. &c. Of its rhetorical application there are many examples, but they are of too little importance to merit insertion.

The preceding are all the observations I am enabled to offer on the use and application of the Persian pronouns, and I shall now proceed to the consideration of Persian nouns.

OF NOUNS.

CHAPTER FIRST.

اسم ظرف

OR

NOUN OF TIME AND PLACE.

Every event must, of necessity, happen at a certain time and in a certain place; and hence all those nouns which are the names of any given time, or of any given space, have been termed

termed ظروف or *Receptacles*, by the Perſian Grammarians. But a given ſubſtantive noun which is truly a ظرف by its own nature, ſuch as شب *The night*, روز *The day*, ماه *A month*, سال *A year*, جای *A place*, *&c. &c.* will not be ſo termed in the language of ſyntax, unleſs it ſhall be employed to denote the time or the place *in which a given event may happen to occur*; and thus the word خانه, which is a ظرف in the following ſentence, زید بخانهٔ خود نشسته است "ZYDE is ſitting in his own houſe," will ceaſe to be a ظرف, when uſed to form the ſubject of a given propoſition: (as خانهٔ من خوب است "My houſe is good;" خانهٔ شما بد است "Your houſe is bad;" &c.) becauſe it does not, in this caſe, denote the name of the place in which an event is ſtated to occur. On the other hand, any given ſubſtantive noun occurring after any one of the حروف ظرفیه, ſuch as در *In*, به *In*, *&c. &c.* will be termed a ظرف in the language of grammar, without the leaſt reference to the ſenſe which it may happen to denote; and thus the word فکر is ſaid to be the ظرف in the following ſentence, در فکر فرو رفتم "I was loſt in thought;" although it is obviouſly not the name of any given portion of time or ſpace.

IT may be inferred, therefore, that the nouns compriſed under the term ظرف are naturally of two kinds; *firſt*, the ظرف حقیقی or PROPER ZURF, which is invariably the name of a certain given time, or a certain given ſpace; (or of ſome receptacle ſuch as *a purſe* in which is compriſed a portion of ſpace); and, *ſecondly*, the ظرف مجازی or IMPROPER ZURF, which is not the name of any given time, or of any given ſpace. But if a noun ſhall not be the name of any given time, or of any given ſpace or receptacle, the inſertion of the prepoſition, by which it ſhould be governed, will be invariably neceſſary on every occaſion; for the prepoſition در cannot be omitted in ſuch examples as theſe; در فکر فرو رفتم "I "was loſt in thought;" در بلا گرفتار شده ام "I was involved in mi-

"ſery

"ſery;" &c. &c. and hence it happens, that the uſe of the ظرف مجازی or IMPROPER ZURF, is ſo perfectly ſimple, as to be wholly incapable of illuſtration by the rules of grammar.

On the other hand, the inſertion of the prepoſition, which ought to govern A PROPER ZURF, is ſometimes optional; and ſometimes neceſſary; and ſometimes inadmiſſible; and it will be therefore the object of this chapter, to throw ſuch lights on the inſertion or omiſſion of this prepoſition, as obſervation and enquiry have enabled me to procure. The ſubject, however, is not very eaſy; and the reader will do well, to add to the imperfect rules which I ſhall be able to offer, ſuch farther aids as he can derive from the ſource of his own experience and practical knowledge.

Before I proceed to detail the rules applicable to the inſertion or omiſſion of the prepoſition which ought to govern every ظرف, I think it neceſſary to detail the various claſſes, into which the words of this ſpecies have been divided by the Grammarians of Perſia. Of theſe the firſt in order is the ظرف زمان or *noun of time;* as contradiſtinguiſhed from the ظرف مکان or *noun of place.* And each of theſe is again divided into thoſe which are مبهم or *Indefinite;* as oppoſed to thoſe which are موقت or محدود; that is to ſay, *Bounded;* the former term being applicable to nouns of time, and the latter being applicable to nouns of place.

A ZURF is ſaid to be *bounded,* when it denotes the name of any limited portion of time or ſpace; but the word "limited" is here uſed in a ſenſe which will be beſt underſtood by adverting to an example. Let it be granted that the idea ſignified by the word *night* includes the whole of that portion of time, during which the ſun is below the horizon; and it may be affirmed in that caſe, that the night is, of neceſſity, bounded at both ex-

tremes

tremes by the rising and setting of the sun. On this principle, the word شب *The night*, is termed a ظرف زمان موقّت by the Persian Grammarians; and so also the word خانه *A house*, is termed a ظرف مکان محدود; because every house must be somewhere bounded by its own walls.

But the ideas signified by the words وقت *Time*, جای *Place*, پیش *Before*, پس *Behind*, &c. &c. have not of necessity any bounds; and these words being indefinitely applicable to all time and all space, or to any given portion of time and space, are therefore termed ظروف مبهم by the Persian Grammarians*. There is a farther division of the ظروف into those which are منتقل or *Moveable*, on the one hand, as جام *A cup*; کیسه *A purse*; &c. &c. and into those which are غیر منتقل or *Immoveable*, on the other hand, as چاه *A well*; خانه *A house*; and other examples of the same nature.

It must be obvious to every reader that the preceding division of the ظروف is wholly unimportant in its own nature; and that the utility of its adoption must therefore depend on the facility with which it may enable the reader, to determine the propriety of omitting or inserting the preposition by which every ظرف (according to the grammatical acceptation of that term) ought to be governed. Even in this point of view, I am by no means convinced that the arrangement which I have adopted (for want of a better) will obtain with the approbation of the European reader; and it is not without considerable diffidence, that I submit to his attention the following rules.

* Let us suppose one body to be at rest, and another to be moving before it in a straight line. In this case, the moving body will still be in the *front* or *before* the object at rest, though the motion of the former were to endure forever. It is obvious, therefore, that the words *before*, *behind*, *above*, *below*, *right*, *left*, &c. belong to the class of the ظروف مبهم as explained in the text.

RULE FIRST.

A ظرف زمان موقت may be مخصوص or *specific*, by its own nature, as in the case of اکنون *Now*; or *At this time*; فردا *To-morrow*; or *The coming day*; هنوز *Yet*; or *Up to this time*; همیشه *Always*; or *At all times*; هرگز *Never*; or. *At no time*; &c. And in this case, it seldom admits the insertion of any preposition. Examples: اکنون میروم "I am going now;" فردا خواهم رفت "I shall go tomorrow;" هنوز اورا ندیده ام "I have "not seen him yet;" همیشه نیت خود را خیر دار "Let your in-"tentions be always virtuous;" این کار هرگز مکن "Never do "this;" &c. &c. &c.

RULE SECOND.

Or being naturally indefinite, (as in the case of the word شب which is applicable to any one night as well as to another,) the preposition will yet be most commonly omitted, *first*, if the ظرف shall follow the demonstrative noun; as امشب رسیدم "I arrived to night;" *secondly*, if it shall follow the words چند or هر چند; as چند روز ترا جستم "I sought you for several days;" هردم بیادت می باشم "I am always thinking of you;" *thirdly*, if it shall follow a noun of number; as دو سال خدمتش کردم "I served him for two years;" *fourthly*, if it shall be followed by a relative pronoun; as روزی که ذره ذره شود استخوان من باشد هنوز در دل ریشم هوای تو "Even when my bones shall be "mouldered away, my heart will yet preserve its love for thee;" and, *finally*, if it shall be followed by a substantive noun in the genetive case; as روز قیامت "On the day of judgment;" شب معراج "On the night of the ascension;" (Moohummud's ascension into heaven on the beast براق) &c. &c. In most of the examples of this kind, the preposition may however be inserted, according to the pleasure of every speaker:

as بروز قیامت ; بشب معراج ; and other examples of the same nature.

RULE THIRD.

If a ظرف زمان موقت, being naturally indefinite, shall not be rendered specific in the manner described in the preceding rule; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly inserted. Example: که در شب ارچه گم گردد . بشب گرو است تا وانش "The watchman "is responsible for what is lost in the night." But the omission of the preposition is also very common: Examples: شب چو عقد نماز می بندم "A night when I prepare to pray;" چه خورد بامداد فرزندم "What will my children eat in the morning;" &c. And if the ظرف shall be rendered specific by the context, that is to say, if it shall appear, by the context, to be applicable to a specified or a given time (whether past, present, or future with reference to the speaker,) the preposition will then be generally omitted, even though the ظرف may not be accompanied by any adjective, or by a substantive noun. Examples: سحر آمدم بکویت . بشکار رفته بودی "I repaired to your house in the "morning, (that is to say, in the morning of the day in which "I now speak) but you were gone a hunting;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

If a ظرف زمان مبهم shall be rendered specific by the sense of its attributive; that is to say, by the sense of an adjective, or by the following substantive noun, or by the member of a sentence with which it is connected; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly omitted. Example: هنگام تنگدستی در عیش کوش و مستی "In the season of "poverty strive to be happy;" &c. &c. But many instances of the contrary might be easily adduced. Example: بوقت بیکسی جز سایهٔ من نیست یار من "In the season of distress "I am deserted by every body but my own shadow."

RULE

RULE FIFTH.

If a ظرف زمان مبهم shall not be rendered ſpecific in the manner deſcribed in the preceding rule; the prepoſition, in that caſe, will be moſt commonly inſerted. Example: در دهر کیست که نیست بی عیب "Who is there in the world (literally, "*in time)* without a fault."

RULE SIXTH.

If a ظرف مکان مبهم ſhall be rendered ſpecific by its attributive; that is to ſay, by an adjective, or by the following ſubſtantive noun, or by the member of a ſentence with which it is connected; the prepoſition, in that caſe, will be moſt commonly omitted. Examples: این جا رسیدم "I arrived here;" آنجا دویدم "I run thither;" بیرون در چه کردی "What did you do without the "door;" که درون در درآیی "That you ſhould be admitted "within;" &c. Indeed the words بالا *Above;* زیر *Below;* پیش *Before;* پس *Behind;* and ſome others which have been commonly aſſigned to the claſs of the ظروف مکان مبهم, ſeldom admit the inſertion of any prepoſition, even when they happen to ſtand alone.

RULE SEVENTH.

The prepoſition muſt be generally inſerted before every ظرف زمان محدود whether it ſhall be ſpecific or indefinite, according to the ſenſe of theſe terms, as already explained in the preceding rules. Examples: بخانه می روم "I am going home;" در خانهٔ شما کیست "Who is there in your houſe?" یارم در کلکته رسید "My friend arrived in Calcutta;" &c. &c. But ſome examples of the contrary may be heard in converſation, though they ſeldom occur in written compoſition: as خانه می روم "I am "going

"going home;" کلکته می روم "I am going to Calcutta;" &c. If the ظرف shall be of the class termed مستقل, as already explained, the insertion of the preposition is indispensibly necessary. Example: آب در کوزه ریختم "I poured water into the "pitcher;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

The preceding are all the rules of Persian syntax, which seem to me to have any relation to the insertion or omission of the preposition that ought to govern every ظرف. It results from these rules, that the insertion or omission of that preposition depends, in a great measure, on the specific or indefinite sense of the ظرف, which may happen to be employed on a given occasion. For if the word شب *The night*, for example, shall be so employed as to be exclusively applicable to some one or more nights, as opposed to all the other nights in the year; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly omitted; (شبی تا روز خفته بودم) without the least reference to the *means*, by which the indefinite and general sense of that word has been thus restricted. And if the same word shall continue, in the context, to retain that indefinite and general sense which belongs to every generic noun before its restriction to individuals by the means of definitives, or by any other means; the preposition, in that case, will be most commonly inserted: as در شب هرچه گم گردد "Whatever is lost in the night;" (that is to say in *any night*) and other examples of the same nature. I now proceed to consider the nature of GENERIC NOUNS and the manner in which those general terms are so restricted, as to be significant of the individuals composing a species.

CHAPTER SECOND.

اسم جنس

OR

GENERIC NOUNS.

With the exception of proper names, all the nouns that enter into the composition of every language may be accurately comprised under the class of generic nouns or general terms. These general terms denote the name of a given species or a given genus, as مردم *Man*; اسب *The horse*; میوه *Fruit*; دانه *Grain*; روغن *Oil*; ریگ *Sand*; علم *Knowledge*; بر *Virtue*; &c. &c. &c. They are naturally divided into those which denote *material objects* whether animate or not; as مرد *Man*; سنگ *Stone*; &c. and into those which denote *the name of an event*; as علم *Knowledge*; بر *Virtue*; and other examples of the same nature. A generic noun of the first class may be applicable to all the parts of a given substance; as آب *Water*; سیم *Silver*; or it may not be applicable to any part which is less than the whole; as in the case of the word *Man*; which has been defined to signify *the name of a certain reasoning animal*; and consequently cannot be applicable to the various parts, which enter into the composition of man's corporal frame.

A generic noun may denote *the name of the species as opposed to the individuals of which it is composed*; and in this sense of the term it may be accurately affirmed that "*Man* never dies;" or that "*The king* never dies;" because the species continues to survive, though each individual must perish in his turn. Or it may denote collectively *the whole body of individuals composing the members of a given species*; as when we affirm that "*Man* is mortal;" or that "*Man* must die;" which is an assertion (in this sense of the term)

term) perfectly conſiſtent with the former. It may further denote *the name of a ſpecies without reference to any condition whatever*; and this happens when a given propoſition ſhall be at once true of the ſpecies itſelf, and alſo of the individuals compriſed under it: as when we affirm that "The three angles of *the plane tri-* "*angle* are equal to two right angles;" a propoſition which is obviouſly true, whether it ſhall be underſtood to ſignify *the ſpecies itſelf*, on the one hand, or *the individuals*, on the other hand, which are compriſed under it.* A generic noun, by the aſſiſtance of *articles* and other *definitives*, and by the variations of *number*, &c. &c. may be alſo reſtricted ſo as to denote *any one or more individuals, compoſing the members of a given ſpecies*; as when we ſpeak of *that man*; or *thoſe women*; *any man*; or *many women*; and other examples of the ſame nature.

A GENERIC noun is ſaid to be مُعَرَّفٌ or DEFINITE *firſt*, when it denotes the name of the ſpecies without reference to any condition whatever: as "The three angles of *the plane triangle* are equal to "two right angles;" *ſecondly*, when it denotes the name of the ſpecies as oppoſed to the individuals of which it is compoſed; as "*Man* never dies;" *thirdly*, when it denotes collectively the whole body of individuals compoſing the members of a given ſpecies; as "*Man* is mortal;" and *finally*, when it denotes any one or more individuals oppoſed to all the other members of a given ſpecies; as "Shew me *the man*;" "Give me *the books*;" and other examples of the ſame nature. It is ſaid to be مُنَكَّرٌ or INDEFINITE when it denotes, indifferently, any one or more individuals among many others of the ſame claſs; as "Give me a wafer;" that is to ſay, *any wafer*; "Buy me a horſe of a given deſcription;" that is to ſay, "Buy me *any horſe* that may happen to fall under a given deſcrip-

* That the propoſition in the text is true of the individuals will be at once admitted by every reader. That it is alſo true of the ſpecies, conſidered without reference to the individuals compriſed under it, follows of neceſſity from the following conſideration: *namely*, that it would continue to be true, though there were no ſuch thing as an individual plane triangle to be found in nature.

"tion."

"tion." If it be affirmed, therefore, that "A friend called on me "this morning," the word *friend* will be here *definite*; becauſe it is intended to be applicable to *one* individual, as oppoſed to every other individual of the ſame claſs. In this caſe the letter یای وحدت or *Ya of unity* will be generally added to the word ſignifying *a friend* in the Perſian language; and if that word be truly indefinite, as in the following example "Would I had a "friend (that is to ſay *any* friend) to adviſe with on this occaſion," the ſame letter will be generally added, under the denomination of یای تنکیر or *The indefinite Ya*.

The abſence of the letter ی from any given generic noun, is alone ſufficient to determine the *definite* character of that noun according to the ſeveral acceptations of the word معرّف or DEFINITE, as already explained. There are, however, ſome verbal definitives; ſuch as آن *That*; and, این *This*; هر *Every*; همه *All*; &c. &c. any one of which may of courſe be employed as occaſion requires. The following are all the rules which I have been able to collect in the language regarding the uſe and application of Perſian generic nouns; and theſe rules are equally applicable (unleſs in certain caſes which will be duly noticed) as well to thoſe nouns which denote *the name of an event*, as to thoſe which denote *the name of a ſubſtance*.*

RULE FIRST.

A GENERIC noun, being employed to denote the name of a ſpecies unreſtricted by attributives of any kind, will be invariably uſed in the ſingular number; and has no occaſion for any definitive. Examples: شهوت آتش است از وی حذر باید بود "Luſt is fire, beware of it;" از نفس پرور هنر نیاید "Know-

* I think it neceſſary to ſtate that every Perſian adjective or compound epithet which may ſupply in its abſence the place of a given ſubſtantive noun (as سفله for مرد سفله *A mean man*, &c.) will be conſidered by me as a generic noun.

"ledge

"ledge or Skill is not to be expected from the indolent man;" (literally, from the *self-cherisher*) وَ بی هنر سروری را نشاید "And the unskilful or ignorant man is unfit to command." سفله چو جاه آمد و سیم و زرش "When the man of low habits "has risen to rank and wealth;" سیلی خواهد بضرورت سرش "He will deserve (by his conduct) to be well kicked." (Literally, *his head will certainly require a cuffing.*) پدر را عسل بسیار است "Fathers have much honey;" (or indulgence) ولیکن پسر گرمی دار است "But children are hot-headed." دانا چون طبلهٔ عطار است خاموش و هنر نمای "The "wise man resembles the box of the perfumer, "dispensing its fragrance, (shewing his skill) in silence;" و نادان چون طبل غازی بلند آواز و میان تهی "And the ignorant "man resembles the warlike drum, noisy but empty." &c. &c.

REMARKS.

I conceive that all the generic nouns, employed in these examples, are intended to denote the name of the species; or to be generally, that is to say collectively, applicable to all the individuals comprised under it. And hence they have not the least occasion for any definitive, nor is it necessary to put them into the plural number; though the idiom of our language frequently requires the use of that number, in such cases. Thus the word پدر, in the example پدر را عسل بسیار است, must be translated by the plural number; and if we should employ the singular number in order to convey the same idea, (as *the father*, that is to say, the species of nouns comprised under the term *father* has much indulgence) it would no doubt be an offence against idiom; which might, however, be defended on the principles of analogy. For it may doubtless be accurately affirmed in our language that "The "*horse* has many useful properties;" and as the word *horse*, in the singular number, is here used to denote the name of a species;

 so

so there can be no reason but that of idiom, why the word *father* should not be also used in the same number, in order to denote the name of a species. The word *horse* cannot, however, be so used in our language without an article; whereas the Persians never employ an article in such cases. But if we substitute the word *man* for the word *horse*, (as "Man is an animal") the article will also disappear in our language; and as there cannot, in this case, be any good reason for withholding from the *man* what we give to the *horse* (or vice versa) so it must be thence inferred that the use of articles is greatly abused in our language. It would have been much more consistent to give or to withhold the article from both; and the latter is the plan which has been adopted in the Persian Language.

RULE SECOND.

A GENERIC noun, being employed to denote the name of a species restricted by attributives of any kind, will be invariably used in the singular number; and has no occasion for any definitive. Examples: مرد بی مروت زن است "The "man without humanity is (no better than) a woman;" وزاهد با طمع رهزن "And the covetous devotee is a robber." عالم ناپرهیزگار کور مشعله دار "The learned man who does "not abstain from sin is like the blind man who carries "a torch in his hand." فریب دشمن مخور "Be not blind to "the wiles of your enemies;" وغرور مداح مخر "And beware "of the pride inspired by the flatterer;" که آن دام زرق نهاده "For "the one has spread the snare of hypocrisy;" واین کام طمع گشاده "And the other has opened the mouth of avidity."

REMARKS.

IN all these examples, the generic nouns are restricted by a certain attributive; as when we say in English "The *wise* man

"or

" or The man *of wiſdom* ſpeaks little." The general (I do not ſay the univerſal) effect of this attributive will be to exclude from the ſignificance of the generic noun, certain objects to which, in its utmoſt latitude, it would be obviouſly applicable; as when we ſay, with reference to the preceding example, that *fools* are excluded by the epithet *wiſe*. This excluſion having taken place, the reſt of mankind will form, by themſelves, a given ſpecies; of which a Perſian is at liberty to affirm or deny whatever he pleaſes, without having recourſe to the aid of articles; and without the aſſiſtance of the plural number. I ſhall here obſerve by the way, that the plural number of every generic noun denotes the *individuals* and not the *ſpecies*; for though it may be truly affirmed that "the *King* never dies;" the ſame aſſertion would be utterly falſe when applied to *Kings*. It follows, therefore, that a given propoſition muſt be true of the *individuals*, before the predicate can be accurately aſcribed to a given *ſubject* in the plural number; and that the predicate may be accurately aſcribed to the ſame ſubject in the ſingular number, whenever it is true of the ſpecies, with or without reference to the individuals of which it is compoſed: as "*Man* is mortal;" "*Man* never dies;" and other examples of the ſame nature.

RULE THIRD.

A Generic noun may be followed by the letter یای وحدت or *Ya of Unity*; in which caſe, it will be applicable to ſome one individual; as oppoſed to every other individual *of the ſame claſs*. Example: درویشی بمقامی رسید که صاحب آن بقعه کریم النفس بود

" A Durveiſh arrived at a certain place, the maſter of which was of
" a generous diſpoſition." The generic noun, being *thus reſtricted* at the beginning of a diſcourſe, may be afterwards employed (*without* an adjunct of any kind) to denote the name of *the ſame* individual, in every part of the ſubſequent narrative. *Example*:

درویشی بمقامی رسید که صاحب آن بقعه کریم النفس بود درویش

راه بیابان قطع کرده بود و مانده شده و چیزی نخورده "A durveish arrived
"at a certain place, the master of which was of a
"generous disposition. The durveish had travelled over the
"desert, and was very weary and very hungry."

REMARKS.

The word درویش is the generic noun referred to in this rule; and the reader will perceive, that after being so restricted by the letter یای وحدت or *Ya of unity* at the beginning of the narrative, as to be applicable only to a single individual, it is subsequently employed to denote the same individual, without the aid of any adjunct.

RULE FOURTH.

Or supposing the generic noun to be so restricted at the beginning of the discourse, as to be applicable to two or more individuals, then *each* of these individuals may be accurately typified, in every subsequent part of the narrative, by *any* given generic noun without exception, which shall appear by the context to be descriptive of them. The generic nouns so used will be wholly independent of any adjunct.

EXAMPLE.

دو امیرزاده بودند یکی علم آموخت و دیگری مال اندوخت آن علامهٔ عصر شد و این عزیز مصر گشت پس توانگر بچشم حقارت در فقیه نظر کردی و گفتی من بسلطنت رسیدم و تو همچنان در مسکنت بماندی گفت ای برادر شکر نعمت باری تعالی بر من است که میراث پیغامبران یافتم یعنی علم و تو میراث فرعون و هامان یعنی ملک مصر

"There were *two brothers* (persons) of a noble family,
"one of whom studied the sciences, while the other pursued
"the

" the road to wealth. The one became the most learned " man of his age, and the other ascended the throne of " Egypt. *The rich man* used to look *on the man of learning* " with an eye of contempt; and he would tell him, I have " attained the rank of sovereignty, while you have remained " in a state of poverty. My brother, replied the poor man, " I am bound to be grateful for the bounty of God, who " has conferred on me the inheritance of the prophets, " namely, knowledge; while you have obtained the inheri- " tance of PHAROAH, and (his minister) HAMAUN; that is " to say, the kingdom of Egypt."

REMARKS.

THE generic nouns referred to in this example are the words توانگر and فقیه; which are obviously descriptive of the two brothers. Of the cases* stated in the third and fourth rules, it is proper to observe, that *the demonstrative noun* or *any other definitive*, such as مذکور, مزبور, &c. may accurately precede the generic noun when occasion requires. Thus آن درویش , آن توانگر , آن فقیه , درویش مذکور , توانگر مزبور and other expressions of the same nature, may be often observed in the Persian language in such cases; yet the presence of the demonstrative noun or of any other definitive is seldom necessary to the perspicuity of the sentence, and its omission is generally more elegant than its insertion in my opinion.

RULE FIFTH.

ANY one or more objects, being familiar to the mind of the speaker, and also to the mind of the party addressed, will be sufficiently defined by the generic name, which does not, in this case, require an adjunct. Examples: پادشاه رسید " The King arrived;" در بازار در آمدم " I entered the market;" کتاب بر میز باید گذاشت " Put *that* book on *the* " table;" &c.

 REMARKS.

REMARKS.

Of theſe examples it may be obſerved, that the *King* is known becauſe there is generally but one individual in a whole nation, to whom that term can be accurately applied; and that the *book*, the *market*, and the *table* are known, becauſe the party addreſſed is aware that we have previouſly had occaſion to read the one, to frequent the other, or to write at the third. The application of this rule is very extenſive; and it is clearly impoſſible to define the infinite number of circumſtances, which may tend to convince the ſpeaker that an individual object then preſent to his mind, being alſo familiar to the mind of the party addreſſed, will be at once recogniſed by its generic name.

RULE SIXTH.

If a given generic noun ſhall not be otherwiſe defined by the context, its definite character may yet be inferred from the perſons of any given verb to which it belongs. Examples: زید مردی است خوب صورت و نیک سیرت " Zyde is a " handſome and a good man;" همواره با پدر و مادر احسان کردی " He was always doing good to *his* father and mother;" و با برادران و دوستان بمواسا و ملاطفت پیش آمدی " And conducted " himſelf to *his* brothers and *his* friends with indulgence and " kindneſs;" و با دشمنان طریق مدارا پیمودی " And acted with " civility to *his* enemies;" و پسران را تعلیم تهذیب اخلاق دادی " And taught morality to *his* children;" &c. &c. In all theſe examples, the generic nouns are ſufficiently defined by the perſon of the verbs to which they belong; and the introduction of the word خود, after each generic noun, as دوستان خود، پدر و مادر خود، &c. &c. though certainly admiſſible, would yet be inelegant in my opinion. So, alſo, in the following examples: بحمد الله بوطن رسیدم " Thanks to heaven I arrived at the place

of

of *my* nativity;" وَ همه اقربا را بخیریت یافتم "And found all *my* "relations well; وَزیارت پدرو مادر نمودم "And paid a visit to *my* "father and mother;" وَاز ملاقات برادران چشم مشتاق را تسکینی دادم "And satisfied *my* anxious eyes with the sight of *my* brothers;" وَاز دیدار فرزندان دل را مسرور ساختم "And rejoiced *my* "heart by the sight of *my* children;" &c. &c. &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

If a generic noun shall be employed to denote the whole body of individuals composing the members of a given species, it may be put into the plural number; or it may follow the words هر *Every*, or همه *All* or *Every*, *&c.* Examples: عابدان جزای طاعت خواهند "Devotees desire the reward of their "worship." هرکس بخیال خویش خبطی دارد "Every man is "enchanted with his own ideas;" همه کس را عقل خود بکمال نماید "Every man believes (or All men believe) in the excellence of "his (or their) own understanding;" &c. After the word هر the demonstrative noun ان *That*, or the letter یای وحدت or *Ya of unity* may be given to the following substantive noun. Examples: هران کس که or هرکسیکه (for هریک کس که) *Every man who*; *&c. &c.* And the letter ی may be added to nouns in the plural number; more especially if these shall be followed by the اسم موصول: as کسانیکه ; چیزهائیکه &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

It has already been stated that every generic noun may denote the name of a given species with reference to all the individuals comprised under it; as "*Man* is mortal," or "*Man* must die." And as that which is true of *all* the individuals must be also true of *every* individual, so it may be accurately affirmed of the species itself (when used in this sense of the term) as "*Man* is mortal;" or of

every

every individual comprised under it; as "*All Men* are mortal;" "*Every Man* is mortal;" and other examples of the same nature. This rule, being founded in reason and the nature of things, must be generally applicable to every language. Examples: دانا چون طبلهٔ عطار است "*The wise man* resembles the box "of the perfumer;" دانایان چون طبلهٔ عطار اند "*Wise men* "resemble the box of the perfumer;" &c. &c.

RULE NINTH.

If a generic noun shall be employed to denote the name of some one individual, as opposed to every other individual of the same class, it will be generally followed, on its first occurrence in a given discourse, by the letter یای وحدت or *Ya of unity*. Example: امروز اسپی خریدم و بران برنشسته فرسنگی راه رفتم "I bought *a horse* to-day, and having mounted him, I rode "to the distance of *one furlong*." It has already been stated in RULE THIRD, that the generic noun, being thus restricted at the beginning of a discourse, may be afterwards employed to denote the same individual in every subsequent part of the narrative, without the aid of any adjunct. It may now be added that the adjunct is sometimes (though rarely) omitted at the beginning of the discourse. Example: کس فرستادم for کسی فرستادم or چند کس فرستادم "I sent one or more persons." And that the poets, for some reason which is altogether beyond my comprehension, have not unfrequently employed the demonstrative noun آن *That*, in the sense of the letter یای وحدت or *Ya of unity*, at the beginning of a discourse.

EXAMPLES.

آن جوانمردی زنی زیبا داشت   خانهٔ دل بخیالش آراست

جامی

"A CERTAIN youth had a handsome wife, whose image filled "the chamber of his heart."

آن

آن اعرابی بشتر قانع و بشیر   دریکی بادیه شد مرحله گیر

جامی

"An Arabian, ſatisfied with his milk and his camels, pre-
"pared to travel in a certain deſart."

RULE TENTH.

If a generic noun ſhall be employed in a ſenſe truly indefinite, that is to ſay, if it ſhall be indifferently applicable to any one among all the individuals compoſing the members of a given ſpecies, it will then be generally followed by the letter یای تنکیر or *the indefinite Ya*.

EXAMPLE.

سگی را لقمهٔ هرگز فراموش   نگردد ور زنی صد نوبتش سنگ

وگر عمری نوازی سفلهٔ را   بکمتر چیزی آید با تو در جنگ

"A dog will never forget the mouthful which he has received
"from your hands, however ſeverely you may treat him after-
"wards: an unworthy mind will receive your benefactions for
"an age, and afterwards quarrel with you for the mereſt trifle."

In the preceding example, the reader will perceive that همزه ſupplies the place of the letter ی, after words ending with *the gentle aſpirate*: as سفلهٔ ; لقمهٔ ; &c.

REMARKS.

Of the caſe ſtated in the tenth rule, it ought to be remarked that every thing which is indifferently true of any one, among all the individuals compoſing the members of a given ſpecies, muſt be alſo true of the ſpecies itſelf, and of all the individuals compriſed under it. Accordingly, the word سگ, in the preceding ex-

ample,

ample, might be accurately employed in the singular number without the aid of any adjunct; (سگ را لقمهٔ هرگز فرا موش نگردد) and it will denote, in this case the name of the species: or it might be accurately employed in the plural number; (سگان را لقمه فرا موش نگردد) and it will denote, in this case, all the individuals composing the species. So also in the English language; as "Dogs, or A dog, or The dog, will never forget the "morsel, which he has, or they have, received from your "hands," &c. This remark is nearly the same in subsistance, with that which has already appeared on the SEVENTH RULE.

RULE ELEVENTH.

By a figure of speech the letter ی may denote that sort of unity, which belongs to an individual highly distinguished for his merit, learning, &c. above other individual of the same class. Example: زید مردی است در علم "ZYDE is a man for his learning." The English article *a* is used by SHAKESPEAR in the same sense: as "Nature might stand up, and say to all "the world *This was a man.*"

RULE TWELFTH.

A GIVEN generic noun, being employed to denote the name of an event, will generally preserve the singular number, when followed by a plural substantive noun. Examples: نعمت بزرگان "The favors of the great." عیب حرف گیران "The censure "of the critics." عشوهٔ محبوبان "The glances of our sweet "hearts." ستم پادشاهان "The tyranny of kings." &c. But the plural number may yet be often assumed: as عشوهای محبوبان, نعمتهای بزرگان, and many other examples of the same nature.

RULE THIRTEENTH.

A GIVEN generic noun being applicable to all the parts of a given

given ſubſtance, as آب *Water,* سنگ *Stone, &c.* will ſeldom require the plural number when followed by a plural ſubſtantive noun. Examples: آب انهار "The water of the rivulets;" گوشت حیوانات "The fleſh of animals;" خرمای درختان "The "dates of the trees;" &c. Or, if the ſecond ſubſtantive noun ſhall denote the name of a place in which the ſenſe of the firſt abounds, both nouns may then preſerve the ſingular number. Examples: آب دریا "The water of the ſea, or of the "river;" خرمای درخت "The dates of the trees;" برگ درخت "The leaves of the trees;" &c. The aſſumption of the plural number by the firſt of theſe two nouns is, however, a common occurrence; and, like the word *oils* in our language, the firſt noun will be generally found, in that caſe, to denote the various *ſpecies* comprifed under a given genus which it was formed to denote. Examples: گوشتهای حیوان ; خرمهای درخت ; سبزهای چمن ; &c. &c. &c.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

A GENERIC noun, being employed to denote the name of a living creature, will generally aſſume the plural number, when followed by a given ſubſtantive noun denoting the name of a place in which the ſenſe of the firſt abounds. Examples: مرغان چمن "The birds of the garden;" پرندگان هوا "The birds "of the air;" حیوانات بیشه "The beaſts of the foreſt;" حشرات زمین "The reptiles or creeping things of the earth; &c.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

A GENERIC noun, being employed to denote the name of an inanimate object, will generally preſerve the ſingular number when followed by a plural ſubſtantive noun. Examples: دست مظلومان "The hands of the oppreſſed;" چشم بد اندیشان "The eyes of the malignant;" زبان حرف گیران "The tongues

" of cenſurers;" خانهٔ رعایا " The houſes of ſubjects." Or, if the firſt noun ſhall be put into the plural number, the ſecond will often preſerve the ſingular number; but both may frequently aſſume the plural, and both may often preſerve the ſingular. Examples: خانهٔ درویش; or خانهٔ درویشان; or خانهای درویش; or خانهای درویشان; " The houſes of the poor;" &c.

The reader will obſerve, that the generic nouns noticed in this rule are not applicable to any part of a given ſubſtance which is leſs than the whole; whereas thoſe noticed in RULE THIRTEENTH are applicable to all the parts of a given ſubſtance.

CONCLUSION.

I have now to remark that a given ſpecies cannot be deſtroyed otherwiſe than by the deſtruction of all the individuals of which it is compoſed; for if one man only were left alive in the world, the ſpecies would continue to exiſt in that individual. And hence it follows that a plurality of individuals is by no means neceſſary to the exiſtence of a ſpecies; or, in other words, that a given ſubſtantive noun, which is employed to denote A GENERAL IDEA, will *therefore* be truly a generic noun; though it may not be applicable, in point of fact, to more than one individual object. To explain by an example. The word SUN is uſually applicable to a ſingle object; becauſe there is but one ſun in our ſyſtem; but if inſtead of one we had five hundred ſuns, I conceive that the term SUN denotes a general idea (namely, that of a luminous body performing certain ſpecific functions) which would render it accurately applicable to them all. In this caſe the word SUN is not a proper name but a generic noun; and to the claſs of generic nouns it has been aſſigned, accordingly, by the Perſian Grammarians. The word PERSIA, on the other hand, denotes no general idea; and is merely the proper name of an individual country, which cannot be applied to other countries. The word *Perſia* is therefore truly a proper name.

I shall here notice that Sir William Jones ſeems to have miſtaken the true nature of generic nouns, when, ſpeaking of the expreſſions گل چیدن or گل را چیدن, he tranſlates the firſt by the words *To gather a* (or any) *flower*; and the ſecond by the words *To gather the* (given or particular) *flower*; aſcribing this imaginary difference in the ſenſe of the examples, to the omiſſion or inſertion of the termination را. Both theſe expreſſions are perfectly ſynonimous in my opinion; and the meaning of both is merely this: *To gather that ſpecies of external objects which is known in Perſian by the term* گل. And as it has already been ſtated that a given ſpecies exiſts as perfectly in one flower as in five hundred, ſo it may be accurately affirmed of any individual that *he gathered the ſpecies*, (گل چید or گل را چید) whether he has gathered one or many flowers.

From all that has been ſaid in the preceeding rules, it follows that articles and definitives of every kind are very ſparingly employed in the Perſian Language.

CHAPTER THIRD.

SECTION FIRST.

عَلَم

OR

PROPER NAMES.

The application of proper names is incapable of illuſtration by the rules of grammar; and I ſhall merely obſerve, on this ſubject, that an عَلَم or proper name is defined to be the name of an individual object; and that the Perſians have divided all proper names into three claſſes: *firſt*, thoſe which are merely proper names; as زید ; عمر ; بکر ; &c. *ſecondly*, thoſe termed لَقَب or titles; which convey praiſe or cenſure; as فخر الاسلام ; فخر الدین

 Vide Dict

فخرالدین ; شجاع الدوله ; &c. and *thirdly*, thoſe termed كنيت or PATRONYMIC NAMES; in which the words *father*, *ſon*, *brother*, *ſiſter*, *uncle*, *aunt*, *mother*, *daughter*, *&c.* govern the following ſubſtantive noun in the genetive caſe: as ابو عمر ; ام کلثوم ; ابن الغرض ; and other examples of the ſame nature.

SECTION SECOND.

اسماي عدد

OR

NOUNS OF NUMBER.

THERE is little to be ſaid on the application of theſe nouns to the purpoſes of ſpeech. They are broken into fractions, by prefixing to the numerator the denominator; as چهار یک *One fourth*; ده یک *One tenth*; صد یک *One hundredth part*; *&c.* And the ordinals are generally formed from the cardinal numerals, by adding the letter م *quieſcent* after the vowel ضمه: as یکم *Firſt*; دوم or دویم *Second*; سیوم *Third*; چهارم *Fourth*; نهم *Ninth*; دهم *Tenth*; سی ام *Thirtieth*; چهلم *Fortieth*; *&c.* *&c.* The ſubſtantive muſt generally follow the اسم عدد; and will preſerve invariably the ſingular number. Examples: ده مرد *Ten men*; پنج اسب *Five horſes*; چهار درخت *Four trees*; *&c.* But the اسم عدد may ſometimes be obſerved to follow the ſubſtantive; as سالی دو بریں بر آمد "Two years paſſed after this;" though ſuch examples are very rare.

SECTION THIRD.

اسم الجمع

OR

COLLECTIVE NOUNS.

THESE nouns moſt commonly govern a verb in the ſingular number; but the verb may aſſume the plural according to the option of every ſpeaker.

EXAMPLES.

EXAMPLES.

بفرمود کز جای جنبد سپاه

"He gave orders that the army should move."

سپاه از دو سو صف بیاراستند   هژبران به نخچیر برخاستند

"The army on both sides drew up in order of battle;
"The warriors prepared to seize their prey."

SECTION FOURTH.

کنایات

There are a few words in the Persian language, which are known to Grammarians by the term کنایات. The term کنایه signifies *concealment*; and the words to which I have alluded are distinguished by that term, because the significance of these words is supposed to be obscure. The word چند, for example, is the name of an unknown number which cannot be less than *three* or more than *nine*; and as this uncertainty of the number constitutes an essential or inherent part of the idea signified by the word چند, so this word has been *therefore* assigned to the class of the کنایات as already explained. The word چند signifies *A few*; and, is, in fact, synonimous with اند, ایسند, or ایدند; though the three last words are now nearly or entirely obsolete in the Persian language. The other words known by the term کنایات are *first*, فلان *Such a one*; or *A certain person or thing*; together with its synonimous بهمان or باهمان and باستار (sometimes written وبستار) and, *secondly*, چنان or چنین; as فلان را چنان و چنین گفتم "I "said such and such things to such and such a person;" &c. The application of the کنایات is wholly incapable of illustration by the rules of Grammar; and I shall merely adduce two examples,

ples, to ſhew the occurrence of the letters يا ی معروف و مجهول after the word فُلان that being the only circumſtance regarding theſe words, which requires to be noticed in this place.

دل همان روز ترا دشمن جانی دانست که ترا یار فلانی و فلانی دانست

واقف

"My heart then diſcovered you to be its mortal enemy when "it found that you were the beloved of ſuch and ſuch perſons."

شاهد آن نیست که موئی و میانی دارد بندهٔ طلعت آن باش که آنی دارد

شیوهٔ حور و پری خوب و لطیف است ولی خوبی آنست و لطافت که فلانی دارد

حافظ

Though the meaning of theſe verſes cannot be miſtaken, I am at a loſs to render them in tolerable Engliſh, and muſt therefore transfer the tranſlation to the reader.

SECTION FIFTH.

اَصْوات

The imitative words of the Perſian language are known to Grammarians by the term اَصْوات the plural of صَوْت *A ſound*: as جیک جیک "The chirruping of birds;" کو کو "The cooing "of doves;" کخ کخ "Laughter;" چک چک "The crackling of a "candle when the wick has been wet;" &c. &c. The ſecond member of ſuch words is often connected with the firſt by the intervention of the letter *Alif*; as چکا چاک "The noiſe of the ſuc- "ceſſive ſtrokes of a ſword, mace, cudgel, dagger;" &c. شپا شاپ "The whizzing of ſpears;" فشا فاش "The "whizzing of arrows;" ترنگا ترنگ "The twanging of a "bow;" &c. Example: چکا چاک خنجر بگردون رسید.

THERE

There is nothing to be observed on the application of these words to the purposes of speech, and I shall merely remark that all those terms which are addressed by man to the inferior animals, as خ, خ, &c. have been assigned to this class.

SECTION SIXTH.

اِتْبَاع

The word اِتْبَاع signifies *To follow;* and is technically applied to all those unmeaning words which add nothing to the sense of the word which precedes them. Of these words there seems to be a few in every language, as *hurly burly* in English; تُرْتْ و مُرْت or تَار و مَار *In confusion;* and كُتْ و مُتْ *Exactly;* in Persian, &c.

CONCLUSION.

The preceding chapters contain all the observations I have been able to offer on the nature of nouns abstractedly considered; that is to say, considered without reference to the character which they may happen to assume in the structure of a sentence. But every noun may assume various characters, distinguished in Grammar by various terms; such as مُبْتَدَا ; خَبَر ; فَاعِل ; مَفْعُول ; مُضَاف ; مُضَافٌ اِلَيْهِ ; &c. &c. and it remains, therefore, to consider in their order each of those characters which they are found to assume. Among these, the subject and predicate claim the pre-eminence in point of importance; and will together form the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

مُبْتَدَا و خَبَر

It has already been stated that every nominal sentence must consist of three terms; *namely*, the مُبْتَدَا or SUBJECT OF THE PROPOSITION; the خَبَر or PREDICATE OF THE PROPOSITION; and

the رابط or MARK OF CONNEXION; as زید نویسنده است; "ZYDE is a writer;" &c. The connexion between the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition is known by the terms نسبت خبریه or نسبت حکمیه; and *an affirmative relation* is diſtinguiſhed by the term نسبت ایجابی, as oppoſed to نسبت سلبی *A negative relation*. The accuracy of a given propoſition depends on the exiſtence of what has been called an اتحاد ذاتی و تغایر اعتباری between the extreme terms of which it is compoſed. For if it be affirmed that "This man is virtuous," or "That man is vicious," it is obvious that the ſenſe of the attributes are here conceived to be *in union* with the ſenſe of the ſubſtantive nouns. In the exiſtence of this union conſiſts the اتحاد ذاتی, a condition, of which the abſence will obviouſly deſtroy the accuracy of any propoſition, ſince we cannot affirm that "mind poſſeſſes the attributes of matter," (ſuch as extenſion, &c.) merely becauſe the اتحاد ذاتی cannot, in this caſe, have any place. The تغایر اعتباری conſiſts in the poſſible ſeparation, by the mind, of the ſenſe of the terms compoſing the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition; as "The man is or is not good," "The woman is or is not virtuous," &c. and as the abſence of this condition neceſſarily implies that the ſubject and the predicate are exactly ſynonimous; as "Thought is thought:" "Will is will:" &c. ſo it muſt be obvious, that no information can reſult from any propoſition in which the تغایر اعتباری has no place.

THE foundation of every propoſition has been ſaid by Logicians to reſt on what is termed the عقد الوضع on the one hand; that is to ſay, the exiſtence in the ſubject of the propoſition of a given ſenſe which it was formed to denote; and the عقد الحمل on the other hand; that is to ſay, the aſcription of the ſenſe of the predicate to that of the ſubject of a given

propoſition,

proposition. It follows, therefore, that the subject precedes the predicate in the order of the understanding; because something must be first conceived to exist, before any thing can be affirmed of it. It also follows that the subject must be defined or definite; that is to say, that it must be known; because we can affirm nothing of that which is not defined or known. Supposing therefore that I have occasion to speak of a given fruit; it is obvious that the general term *fruit* must be so restricted as to be applicable to *that particular species of the object* which is then present to my mind; and this is commonly performed in the English language by having recourse to the demonstrative nouns, and to other means: as "*This fruit* is pleasant to the taste, but "*that fruit* is very sour;" &c. Or if the subject of a given proposition shall even be accompanied by an indefinite article, it must yet be definite according to the present acceptation of the term; for if it be affirmed that "*A man* (that is to say that *any man*) may practise virtue;" it is clear that the ability to practise virtue is here ascribed to *every man*; that is to say, *to all men*; or, in other words, to the species itself; from which it follows that the word *man* is here used in a definite sense.

The rules for the application of articles, and of other definitives, are essentially different in various tongues; but those which are applicable to the Persian language have already been detailed in the chapter which treats of generic nouns, and need not be repeated in this place. I proceed therefore to remark (what indeed must be true of every language, *namely*,) that as the subject takes precedence of the predicate in the order of the understanding, so it must take precedence in the order of speech, whenever the opposite order shall be found to be injurious to the sense of the sentence. Some of the following rules serve merely to illustrate a few of those cases, in which the application of this plain principle determines the necessary precedence of the subject.

RULE

RULE FIRST.

Supposing both nouns to be equally capable of becoming the ſubject or the predicate of a given propoſition, the ſubject will take the precedence whenever the relation between them ſhall be that of *converſion*. Example: آری به یمن لطف شما خاک زر شود "Under the auſpices of your favor, earth may indeed *be converted* into gold;" از خدمتت درویش توانگر شود "By ſerving you the poor man will become rich;" وازصحبتت نادان دانا گردد "And "from your ſociety the ignorant will acquire knowledge." But if the context ſhall be ſufficient to determine the ſubject, it may in this caſe follow the predicate; though ſuch examples are chiefly to be found among the Poets, and ſeldom or never occur in proſe. Example: از کیمیای مهر تو زر گشت روی من "The alchy-"my of your love has converted my face into gold."

RULE SECOND.

If the ſubject and the predicate ſhall be the ſame word, governing oppoſite ſubſtantive nouns or pronouns in the genetive caſe, or by means of propoſitions; the ſubject, in this caſe, muſt take the precedence. Example: غلام من غلام تست "My ſlave "is your ſlave;" &c. &c. But even in this caſe, the emphatic pronunciation of the word تست will enable us to give the precedence to the predicate: as غلام تست غلام من; &c.

RULE THIRD.

If both nouns ſhall be equally capable of being the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition, and if no injury to the ſenſe of the ſentence ſhall be the conſequence of their mutual tranſpoſition; that noun will be generally conſidered as the predicate which may happen to be laſt in the order of ſpeech. Example: زید برادر تست "Zyde is your brother;" برادر تو زید است

"Your

" Your brother is Zyde;" &c. &c. But the nature of the objects connected together may often enable us to determine the predicate. Example: کژدم است فلان " Such a man " is a scorpion;" that is to say, " He is *like* a scorpion;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It follows from the nature of the subject and the predicate that the former will be generally a substantive, (denoting the name of an event or the name of a substance) and that the latter will be generally an adjective noun. If the predicate shall yet be a substantive noun, an event which is of common occurrence in every language, the two conditions already stated to be necessary to the accuracy of every proposition (namely the اتحاد ذاتی و تغایر اعتباری) must be always expressed or collected from the sense. Example: زن زید مادر بکر است " The " wife of Zyde is the mother of Bukr;" &c. There is nothing understood in this example, because it is clear that the same individual who is the wife of one man, may or may not be the mother of another; from which it follows, that the conditions alluded to are here present in the terms of the proposition. And if these conditions shall not be present in the terms of the proposition, they must be supplied by the understanding of the hearer; as خانهٔ من دو کروه است; that is to say, دوری خانهٔ من دو کروه است " My house is " two coss (or four miles) off;" زید خر است, that is to say, زید چون خر است در بی‌خردی " Zyde is an ass;" or "Zyde " resembles an ass for his stupidity;" &c. By a figure of speech, the same word may be at once the subject and the predicate of a given proposition; as توئی آنکه تا من منم با منی " Thou art with me while I continue to exist;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

When various adjectives are ascribed in the form of so

many predicates to the same object or substantive noun, they must be generally united by the means of a conjunction to be repeated as often as occasion requires. Example: جوانی چست و لطیف و خندان و شیرین زبان بود "There was a "youth smart, witty, cheerful, and eloquent;" &c. Or, in the absence of a copulative conjunction, the کسرۀ توصیفی must be commonly inserted; and the following adjectives will then be considered as attributes applicable to the *first adjective*, which is alone the true and proper predicate of the proposition. Example: خدای ما کریم رحیم دستگیر پوزش پذیر است "Our God is "bountiful and merciful, the giver of succour and the ac-"cepter of the excuses, which are offered up to him." In poetry, and also in conversation; both connecting particles may be accurately omitted; either for the sake of brevity, or for preserving accuracy in the measure of the verse. Example: مرا یاریست سنگین دل ستمگر سست پیمانی; &c.

RULE SIXTH.

A Perfect sentence may be accurately employed as the subject or the predicate of a given proposition. Example: الله اکبر گفتار من است; or by reversing this order, گفتار من الله اکبر است "My saying is, God is the most high;" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

When the predicate of the proposition shall be a perfect sentence, it will generally comprise a pronoun applicable to the subject; and the occurrence of this pronoun forms the only bond of union which is necessary to establish their connexion together. Examples: یکی از آنانکه غدر کردند با منش دوستی بود "One of those who were guilty of treachery, *he* was on terms of "friendship with me;" درویش هرکجا که شب آمد سرای اوست "A "poor man; wherever the night overtakes him, there *his* "habitation is."

REMARKS.

REMARKS.

THESE examples exhibit a form of conſtruction which has been deemed inadmiſſible according to the rules of Engliſh Grammar; though many examples of its occurrence may, I believe, be eaſily diſcovered by thoſe who will take the trouble to conſult the letters and writings of SWIFT, POPE, and even ADDISON himſelf. Its adoption generally affords a pauſe in the ſentence which is very favorable to the perſpicuity of the ſenſe; as in the following example from SHAKESPEAR'S HAMLET:

"And enterprizes of great pith and moment,
"With this regard *their* currents turn awry,
"And loſe the name of action."

It ſeems to me that SHAKESPEAR here means to aſſert that "the "currents of enterprizes of great pith and moment turn awry;" and if ſo, he has done this with much greater perſpicuity, by adopting the form of conſtruction for which I contend, than he could have done by means of any other form of conſtruction whatever. The little word *their* refers to the whole ſubject of the propoſition, and is much more manageable in its actual poſition, that is to ſay, in its connexion with the word *currents*, than the ſubject would be in the ſame ſituation.

BUT if it ſhould be contended that the word *currents* forms the accuſative and not the nominative caſe, "And enterpriſes, &c. turn awry their currents," I am compelled to admit the fact may be ſo: nay, many people may be of opinion that this laſt is the only form of conſtruction which the text will bear. In that caſe, either of the following examples from the ſame author will ſufficiently prove the object which I have in view: namely, that SHAKESPEAR thought the connexion between the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition ſufficiently eſtabliſhed by the occurrence, in the predicate, of a pronoun applicable to the ſubject of the propoſition.

" But *virtue*, as it never will be moved,
" Though lewdneſs court it in a ſhape of heaven ;
" So luſt, though to a radiant angel linked,
" Will ſate itſelf in a celeſtial bed,
" And prey on garbage."
" Are not theſe woods
" More free from peril than the envious court ?
" Here feel we but the penalty of ADAM,
" The ſeaſons difference; as the icy fang,
" And churliſh chiding of the winter's wind ;
" *Which*, when it bites and blows upon my body,
" Even 'till I ſhrink with cold, I ſmile and ſay,
" This is no flattery: theſe are counſellors,
" That feelingly perſuade me what I am."

I BELIEVE there is no Engliſhman who will be diſpoſed to admit, unleſs the fact can be clearly eſtabliſhed, that the poetry of theſe fine paſſages has been disfigured by the author's inattention to the rules of grammar : yet the word *virtue*, in the firſt example, is connected with the following verb, not *directly*, but merely by the intervention of the pronoun *it*. Without reference to the poetry, I ſhall venture to affirm, that the expulſion of that pronoun would deſtroy entirely the force of the antitheſis; " But as virtue never will be moved," &c. and I leave it to thoſe grammarians who have condemned the form of conſtruction to which I have adverted, to ſhew how the expreſſion of the ſentiment, as it ſtands in the text of its great author, can be improved.

BUT the accuracy of this form of conſtruction has no dependance on any antitheſis; for we find the word *which* in the ſecond example " which when it bites and blows upon my body," indirectly connected with its only verb, namely the word *bites*, in the very ſame way. And here again, I may bid defiance to any grammarian to change one word in the ſentence, without detract-

ing from the perſpicuity, as well as the poetry of the paſſage. What indeed can be more reaſonable than it is to ſtate, in the firſt place, the ſubject to which we have occaſion to call the attention of the hearer; "The perſon of whom I had occaſion to ſpeak to you the other day," and ſubſequently to get rid of this long ſentence by means of a ſimple pronoun? "*his* father, who is my intimate friend, is deſirous to introduce him to your notice."

Now if this form of conſtruction ſhall be admitted to reſt on reaſonable principles, (a propoſition I think which cannot be denied) it will yet be inadmiſſible in the Engliſh language wherever the uſe of it has not been ſanctioned by the authority of thoſe writers who have attained the rank of claſſical eminence: but why the examples of its occurrence ſhould be ſelected from the works of our beſt authors, for the purpoſe of proſcribing the principle on which it reſts, is a queſtion which is very far beyond the reach of my underſtanding.

It may be admitted that the uſe of it in the following example from Atterbury's Sermons, (ſee Lowth's Grammar, page 131) is not very happy: "Which rule if *it* had been obſerved, a "neighbouring prince would have wanted a great deal of that "incenſe which had been offered up to him by his adorers;" and the alteration propoſed by Doctor Lowth, *If this rule had been obſerved*, may perhaps be regarded as an improvement of the paſſage. But when Doctor Lowth proceeds to condemn the principle on which it is founded, by remarking that "The pronoun "*it* is here the nominative caſe to the verb *obſerved;*" and that, "*which rule* is left by itſelf a nominative caſe without any verb "following it," and that "this manner of expreſſion however im-"proper is very common;" I am tempted to aſk whether the cenſure of Doctor Lowth does not extend to the moſt commonly received expreſſions in the Engliſh language: as when we affirm that *it began to rain; &c.* For if it were aſked what began? it muſt be certainly anſwered that the event began which is ſignified

 by

by the verb *to rain;* and to this event and no other we must of necessity refer the pronoun *it*. *It began to rain: To rain, it* or *that began:* &c. So, also, in the celebrated soliloquy of HAMLET: "To be or not to be, *that* is the question:" where the expulsion of the pronoun *that* would disfigure the sentence beyond the sufferance of human patience.

IF I were disposed to justify the expression of ATTERBURY which has been condemned by Doctor LOWTH, I might accurately reason in the following manner: How can that be improper in Language which is at once perfectly intelligible, and admitted to be of common use among the best authors? Let it be granted that *which rule* is in the nominative case, and that it is not *directly* followed by any verb; and the fair inference from these premises will be, not that ATTERBURY has committed a violation of the rules of English Grammar, but that the nominative case does not in our language require to be *directly* connected with the verb. It is *indirectly* connected with it (by the intervention of the pronoun *it*) in the very example which is the subject of discussion; and this, being the admitted practise of many good authors, constitutes all that is necessary to establish the accuracy of an English proposition. For it may be affirmed as an unerring truth that every thing is good English, which is at once perfectly intelligible and of common use among the best authors; and there can be no reason of necessity why every nominative must be *directly* connected with its verb, if a given proposition can be rendered intelligible by means of a nominative which is not directly but *indirectly* connected with it. The proposition in question is perfectly intelligible, and the alteration proposed by Dr. LOWTH, adds nothing to the perspicuity of the sense. Why then should we adopt that alteration? or why banish from our language a form of construction so favorable to perspicuity as that which is here proscribed by him? The grammarian undertakes too much who proposes to *improve* the langauge of which he treats. It was the business of Dr. LOWTH to illustrate the rules applicable to the *existing* language

of

of the Engliſh nation as he found it recorded in their beſt authors; not to ſet up the authority of his own precepts againſt his true and legitimate maſters converting, by this means, the majority of his examples into a ſevere ſatire againſt his own rules, by which they are condemned.

There are caſes, indeed, in which a grammarian may call in queſtion the language of any human authority; but if the object of his hoſtility ſhall be a great maſter ſpeaking the language of his native country, the grammarian ought to be very certain that his ſtrictures are founded in truth. But his ſtrictures cannot be ſo founded, if the diſputed expreſſion ſhall be at once perfectly intelligible and of common uſe among the beſt authors; becauſe there is nothing elſe but this neceſſary to eſtabliſh, in any language, the propriety and accuracy of a given propoſition. Dr. Lowth admits that the manner of expreſſion which he has condemned is of common occurrence in the Engliſh language; and as the perſpicuity of the phraſe will not be queſtioned by any reader, it follows that the manner of expreſſion ſhould not be *generally* condemned by him. Of the particular accuracy of its application, in the inſtance quoted from Atterbury's ſermons, I have already expreſſed ſome heſitating doubts; and they are founded in my belief that Atterbury has there deviated from the common uſage of the Engliſh tongue, by the unuſual application to a given propoſition, of a form of conſtruction which, though perfectly accurate in many caſes, has yet been condemned by cuſtom in many others.

* * * * *

The form of conſtruction to which I have adverted is of conſtant occurrence in the Perſian Language, of which it may be remarked as a general truth, that any ſentence which contains a pronoun applicable to the ſubject, may be accurately employed as the predicate of a given propoſition; whatever may be the nature of the relation exiſting between them.

EXAMPLE.

EXAMPLE.

خواجهٔ درویش مشرب در جوانی به پیری ملقب گمان فقیر آنست که
مقصود وی از مهاجرت اوطان و مفارقت اخوان زیارت درویشان است
و تقرب بملازمت ایشان نه تحصیل آمال و امانی و حصول مزخرفات فانی

" THE pious Khaja who has acquired in his youth the excel-
" lencies of age; my opinion is, that in leaving *his* home and
" quitting the society of *his* friends, *he* has been influenced
" by a desire to visit holy men, and to obtain admission into
" their society; not by a wish to indulge in the trifling pleasures
" and transitory gratifications of this life."

IN this example, the words خواجهٔ درویش مشرب در جوانی به پیری ملقب form the subject of the proposition, to which all that follows must be considered as the predicate. The connexion between them is sufficiently established by the occurrence in the predicate of the pronoun وی. The example is taken from the letters of JAUMEE, in which many others of the same nature might be easily found.

RULE EIGHTH.

THE subject and the predicate of a given proposition must be united by the means of a رابط, or *mark of connexion*; and the رابط will generally follow the predicate of the proposition, or the last predicate if there shall be more than one. Examples: زید زیرک است " ZYDE is intelligent;" دلبرم شیرین زبان و یگانهٔ زمان است " My mistress is eloquent and peerless in the age;" &c.

RULE NINTH.

IN poetry or in measured prose the رابط may yet be inserted any where, according to the option of every writer; with

with this only exception, that اَست must be used for اِسْت as the first member of an affirmative sentence. Examples: شِکَم بَنْدِ دَسْت اَسْت وَ زَنْجِیرِ پایْ "The belly binds up the hands "and the feet;" خُدا اَسْت رَزّاق وَرُوزِی رَسان "God is the "universal provider;" دُون اَسْت وَناسِپاس وبی عَقْلِ حَقْ ناشِناس "He is mean, ungrateful, and ignorant of his duties;" خُداوَنْدِ یگانه که مُدَبِّرِ اِین کارخانه وَمُقَلِّبِ اَوْضاعِ زَمانه اَسْت "The only "true God who is the ruler of the world, and the source of "all the events that happen therein;" &c. Though the words نِیسْت زَیْد نَوِیسَنْده or اَسْت زَیْد نَوِیسَنْده might be accurately employed to signify "Zyde is or is not a writer;" the word اَسْت must always follow some other word, and will never occur at the beginning of a sentence.

RULE TENTH.

In a negative sentence the letter نُونِ نَفْی is generally prefixed to the رابِط; as تُوانگَر نِیسْتَم "I am not rich;" but there are several exceptions to this rule, some of which are detailed in that which follows.

RULE ELEVENTH.

If the same predicate shall be applicable to each of two or more subjects, the letter نُونِ نَفْی will be often prefixed to each of those nouns that form the subjects. Example: نَه زَیْد نیک اَسْت نَه عَمْر "Neither is Zyde good nor is Amr." Or if the case shall be reversed; that is to say, if there shall be more than one predicate to the same subject; the letter نُونِ نَفْی will be often repeated in the same way. Example: نَه زَیْد عالِم اَسْت نَه عاقِل "Zyde is neither "learned nor wise." Or if the negation shall be intended to destroy a necessary connexion that might be otherwise supposed to exist between the subject and the predicate of a given propo-

fition, the negative particle will be generally the firſt word in the ſentence. Example: نه هر که بصورت نیکوست بسیرت زیبا دراوست "Every handſome man is not therefore poſſeſſed of a good diſ"poſition;" &c. &c.

RULE TWELFTH.

Of the three terms compoſing the members of a given propoſition, any one (or more) may be accurately omitted whenever its abſence can be eaſily ſupplied by the underſtanding of the reader. Examples: چیست دنیا از خدا غافل بدن "In what conſiſt the evils "of the world?" In our indifference to God the creator of "the world." The word دنیا *The world*, is here the ſubject of enquiry; and being ſtated in the queſtion, it is therefore omitted in the anſwer which is here given by the interrogator himſelf. بتندی سبک دست بردن بتیغ بدندان گزد پشت دست دریغ "To "give way to anger (is evil; and he who does ſo) will have "occaſion to gnaw the hand of regret." The words between parentheſes are omitted in Perſian; and their place is ſupplied by the following ſentence deſcribing the conſequences that flow from the indulgence of angry paſſions. Such omiſſions, though very common in the Perſian Language, are generally inadmiſſible in our Tongue.

RULE THIRTEENTH.

The omiſſion of the connective will be deemed elegant in verſe or in meaſured proſe, whenever the ſubject, being followed a relative clauſe, ſhall be united with a predicate which is an اسم تفضیل. Example: بدان در هر که بالاتر فروتر "Thoſe "who are higheſt in rank (or in their own conceit) are loweſt in "the eſtimation of God." Or if the predicate ſhall be a ſimple adjective noun, the connective will yet be often omitted for the ſake of the ſound. Example: نه هر که در مجادله چست درمعامله درست "Every wrangler is not *therefore* a good man of buſineſs."

RULE

RULE FOURTEENTH.

The connective will be often omitted when two propositions shall be directly opposed to each other; as ما چو ذرّه پستیم وآن خورشید بس عالی مقام "We are mean as "atoms, and that luminary is of infinite dignity;" or in a negative ſentence; as تو بکس و کس بتو مانند نی "Neither doſt THOU re-"ſemble any other being, nor does any other being reſemble THEE." Or if the ſubject, being an infinitive, ſhall be connected with a predicate which is by ſenſe or otherwiſe an اسم تفضیل. Example بدست آهک تفته کردن خمیر به از دست بر سینه پیش امیر "To "prepare unſlaked lime with the hands, (or, in other words, To "practiſe manual labour) is better than ſubmitting to the humi-"lity of ſervitude." Or if the predicate ſhall be a verb in the preterperfect tenſe: as خوشتر ز چشم مست تو چشم جهان ندیده "Nothing "was ever ſeen more beautiful than your animated eyes;" &c.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

The three terms of a given propoſition are ſuſceptible, in the Perſian language, of the variations of number. If the ſubject ſhall be of the plural number and of the rational ſpecies, the رابط will aſſume the plural number; but the predicate will moſt commonly retain the ſingular, though many examples of the contrary might be adduced. Examples: ایشان توانگراند or ایشان توانگر استند "They are rich;" ما بیچارگانیم or ما بیچاره ایم "We are unfortu-"nate;" &c. The aſſumption by the predicate of the plural number, ſeems to have been anciently very common; but, in modern times, the ſingular number is generally retained; and the رابط alone aſſumes the plural. That the رابط ſometimes (though rarely) retains the ſingular, the following example will ſufficiently evince: خوبان اصفهان چو شیرازی پسند نیست "Since "O SHIRAZE you like not the damſels of Iſfahaun;" &c.

RULE

RULE SIXTEENTH.

If the subject, being in the plural number, shall be the name of an animal not rational, the رابط will generally assume the plural, and the predicate will commonly retain the singular number. Example: شیران بیشه گاه سگ آستانه اند "The tygers "of the wilderness are as dogs before the threshold of his door." Of the retention by the رابط of the singular number, some examples might be easily adduced: (as شتران بود مرا جمله نجب "I had a number of camels of an excellent breed,") yet I am persuaded that the رابط in this case will be generally found to be in the plural number.

RULE SEVENTEENTH.

If the subject, being the name of an inanimate object, shall assume the Persian form of the plural in ان, the رابط will often assume the plural and the predicate will preserve the singular number. Examples: درختان سبز شدند "The trees "are become green;" چراغان روشن گشتند "The lamps have "been lighted;" &c. But in this case the singular number may be accurately retained: as ؛چراغان روشن گشت ؛درختان سبز شد and in the case of an Arabic plural of the imperfect class, or of a Persian plural formed in ها, the singular number will be most commonly retained, if the subject shall be the name of an inanimate object. Examples: موجب علم الیقین نبود براهین و حجج "Proofs and arguments (drawn from reason) are not the best "means to ascertain the truth;" * میان ما و دوست دریاها حایل شد "Seas

* It is the creed of the Soofees, that there are two modes of acquiring knowledge; the one by the exercise of reason and reflexion; the other by the means of fasting and prayer. The knowledge acquired by the exercise of reason is termed by them ؛علم الیقین as opposed

" Seas intervene between me and my beloved ;" &c. Those Arabic plurals which denote the names of inanimate objects generally follow the same rules with the Persian plurals of that class.

RULE EIGHTEENTH.

When various nouns are connected together by means of copulative conjunctions, they will generally require the verb to be in the plural number; if they shall denote the names of living creatures. Examples:

---

posed to the other species of knowledge, which is indifferently termed عين اليقين or حق اليقين; though many have established a distinction between the two last terms. To explain by examples. We infer the presence of fire when we have seen the smoke; and this is an instance of the علم اليقين; but if we see the fire, or if we fall into it, we are absolutely certain of the presence of fire: and this more perfect species of knowledge is termed by the Soofees عين اليقين or حق اليقين; the last term denoting a species of knowledge still more infallible than that which precedes it. The mind of a true Soofee, purified from the mists of the flesh by the continual contemplation of the Divine perfections, becomes, as it were, an unsullied mirror; in which is reflected, by the light of immediate inspiration, the very omniscience of the Deity himself. His soul is not, like his body, restricted to any local habitation; since we hear of Soofees, who have carried on spiritual conversations together, though their persons were separated by the intervention of many thousand miles. In fact, it is difficult to set any bounds to the miraculous powers of a perfect Soofee; because the limitation of his power is understood to imply that he has not yet attained all the perfection of which his nature is susceptible even in this world. With the exception of his final absorption in the essence of the Deity, in which consists the completion of his beatitude, I am not aware indeed, that there is any limit to the perfections attainable by him in this world. As iron when put into the fire, acquires all the properties of light and heat by which we can distinguish that element; so a Soofee, absorbed in the continual contemplation of the Deity, is supposed to be gradually (but in the end wholly) assimilated to him. I remember a story related in some Oriental books, which, though absurd in itself, may throw some light on the ideas entertained of the knowledge of the Soofees. The celebrated Aboo Alee Syna (Avicenna) is considered as the greatest philosopher, as well as physician, that ever existed among the Oriental nations. Like a true philosopher, he did not pretend to the possession of any knowledge but such as he was able to acquire by study and reflexion. He was a contemporary of the not less celebrated Abool khyre, a Soofee of the very first order, who trusted for the acquisition of knowledge, to fasting and prayer. A conversation took place between these two eminent persons, in which each had reason to admire the profundity of the other in matters of science. At the conclusion of the conversation the philosopher addressed the Soofee in these terms: آنچه تو می بینی من میدانم " What you see I know;" that is to say, " I know it by the exercise of reason and reflection:" to which the Soofee replied; آنچه تو میدانی من می بینم " What

Examples: زید و عمرو خرسند شدند "ZYDE and AMR were pleafed;" اسپ و گاو فربه شدند "The horfe and the cow have become "fat;" &c. If the nouns fhall not be the names of animals, the fingular number will be generally retained: but the ufe of the plural will be often optional to every fpeaker. Example: تازه شدند or باز در باغ لاله و سنبل تازه شد "The tulip and "the hyacinth have once more fprung up in the garden."

RULE NINETEENTH.

IF the fenfe of a given fubftantive noun, denoting the name of a living creature, fhall be multiplied by means of an اسم عدد; the verb will generally affume the plural, but the fingular number may yet be retained. Example: ترا هزار اسیر اند or ترا هزار اسیر است "You have a thoufand lovers;" &c. If the fubftantive noun fhall not be the name of a living creature, the fingular number will be generally retained. Example: دو کار است با فرّ و فرخندگی "There are two things extremely "proper in their own nature."

RULE TWENTIETH.

IF the nominative fhall be a collective noun, or if it fhall follow

"What you know I fee," that is to fay, "I fee it by the light of divine infpiration." The SOOFEE however had the advantage of the philofopher; for it is faid, that having occafion to build a houfe, he iffued a fuccefsful order to one of the beams that happened to be too fhort for his purpofe, to extend its length by two or three feet. It may be conjectured that the philofopher did not poffefs, among the ftores of his knowlege, any fecret which would have enabled him to perform this fingular feat.

The verfe in the text, which has given occafion to this note, will now be better underftood. It is as follows:

چشم جان را ده جلا یکدم ز گفت و گوی عقل
موجب عین الیقین نبود براهین و حجج

"Brighten the eyes of your foul (by the contemplation of the divine perfections.) and do not "puzzle yourfelf with the exercife of reafon; for proofs and arguments drawn from reafon "will never lead you to the عين اليقين."

the

the words هر، همه، جمله، &c. the verb may be put into either number; but the singular number will be most commonly retained in the case of a nominative denoting the name of an inanimate object. Examples: لشکر جمع شد or جمع شدند "The army has been assembled;" هر آدمی مضطرب گشت or مضطرب گشتند "Every man was, or all men were alarmed;" همه کس بدحال گردید or بدحال گردیدند "All men were, "or every man was reduced to distress;" &c. In the proper acceptation of the terms, there is a difference between the words همه and هر; the one corresponding in point of sense with the word *all*, and the other with the word *every*; but notwithstanding that, both these words admit of being occasionally followed by a verb in either number, because each will be found to assume occasionally the sense of the other. The plural number will yet be generally preserved after همه, and the singular number after هر.

CONCLUSION.

It follows from the preceding rules, that the concord of number between the verb and its nominative is very little regarded in the Persian language; since there is not, perhaps, a single rule to which many exceptions might not be adduced. These rules (such as they are) are equally applicable to a sentence consisting of *two* or of *three* terms: that is to say, they are applicable to any sentence whether it shall consist of a *subject*, *a predicate*, and a *mark of connexion*; or merely of a *nominative* followed by its *verb*. Of the nominative followed by its verb, I am now about to treat; and shall therefore have occasion to resume the subject of the concord between them, and to place it, perhaps, in a clearer light than that in which it has been placed in this chapter. I have remarked on a former occasion that the vowel کسره and the letter نون, when joined to the predicate of a given proposition, possessed anciently the sense of the

substantive

ſubſtantive verb : as زَيدٌ دَبِيرٌ "ZYDE is a writer;" عَمرٌ خوشْ "AMR is happy;" &c. but theſe connectives are now obſolete in the Perſian language, and they are utterly incapable of the variations of number, tenſe, and perſon.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

فَاعِل OR AGENT TO AN ACTIVE OR A NEUTER VERB.

THE predicate of a given propoſition may be a noun ſuſtantive or adjective; and the ſubject, in that caſe, will be termed the مُبْتَدَا, as already explained in the preceding chapter. But if the predicate ſhall happen to be a NEUTER VERB, or a TRANSITIVE VERB in the ACTIVE VOICE, the ſubject will then be termed the فَاعِل or AGENT; and the rules which determine the application of the فَاعِل to the purpoſes of ſpeech, are to form the ſubject of the preſent chapter. Before I proceed to detail theſe rules, I think it proper to offer a few obſervations on the nature of the diſtinction, real or imaginary, which is ſuppoſed to exiſt between the مُبْتَدَا and the فَاعِل.

THE Arabian Grammarians have remarked that the مُبْتَدَا muſt be generally defined by ſome means or other; though the means by which definition is attainable in the Arabic Language are exceedingly various. They have alſo remarked that this is not true with regard to the فَاعِل, which is often found, in their language, to be wholly indefinite. Now if there be any truth in this obſervation, (and of its general truth there can be no doubt, though ſome particular exceptions might be found, perhaps, in the Arabic language) it ſeems to imply that there is an eſſential diſtinction between the مُبْتَدَا and the فَاعِل; and the Grammarians of Arabia have accordingly exerted their ingenuity to diſcover the nature of this diſtinction, though in my opinion without

without any ſucceſs. The arguments employed by them have certainly no reference to any other than the Arabic Language; and they are ſo intimately connected with the ſtructure of that language, that they would not be eaſily rendered intelligible to any other than an Arabic ſcholar.

I SHALL therefore omit theſe arguments entirely; but as the fact ſeems to me to be curious, though it may not perhaps be accounted uſeful, I ſhall venture to ſubmit to my readers the ideas on the ſubject, which have been ſuggeſted to me by Molovee ALLAH DAUD; a man, in my opinion, whoſe learning, conſiderable as it is, is greatly excelled by the talents for which he is indebted to nature. All that I have to ſay will occupy only a very few lines, and cannot therefore do much miſchief, if it ſhall not be productive of any good*.

THE مُبتدا is the ſubject of a nominal ſentence, that is to ſay, of a ſentence conſiſting of nouns only; and the فاعل is the ſubject of a verbal ſentence, that is to ſay, it is the agent to an active or a neuter verb. In the Arabic language the firſt is found to be invariably definite; and the ſecond is often indefinite; a fact for which I conceive there muſt be ſome reaſon, founded not merely in the idiom of the Arabic language, but even in the nature of the thing itſelf. But if it be founded in the nature of the thing itſelf, the reſolution muſt be found by adverting to the application of a nominal, as oppoſed

* Molovee ALLAH DAUD is the head of the native officers, employed in the Perſian department of the College of Fort William. He is therefore attached to my office; and to his aſſiſtance I have been invariably and ſolely indebted in the progreſs of this laborious work. Better aſſiſtance no man need deſire, and I, for my part, know not where I could obtain his equal. For learning, he has probably many equals, and ſome ſuperiors, though thoſe who know him, muſt alſo know that his education has been the beſt which his country affords. A pupil of the celebrated TUFFUZZOOL HOOSYNE KHAN, he has learnt to think for himſelf; and as his abilities are of the firſt order, his opinions according to my judgment are generally right. With what ſucceſs I have availed myſelf of the able aſſiſtance of this man, in compiling the work in which I am engaged, is a queſtion which muſt be decided hereafter by the public opinion.

to the application of a verbal ſentence; becauſe this is the only point by which it can be determined whether the ſubject of a given propoſition muſt be definite or otherwiſe in either caſe.

Now the nominal and the verbal ſentence are very generally convertible together; for we ſay, with equal accuracy, "JOHN writeth;" or "JOHN is writing;" "JAMES readeth;" or "JAMES is reading;" &c. Yet it does not ſeem to accord with reaſon, or with the general uſage of language in other reſpects, that there ſhould never be any diſtinction between them; becauſe, in that caſe, it is moſt probable that many nations, ſatisfied with the invention of one, (which muſt have anſwered every purpoſe of both) would have ſaved themſelves the trouble of inventing the other. In what, then, conſiſts the general principle which regulates in language the application of a nominal as contradiſtinguiſhed from a verbal ſentence?

I HAVE already admitted that both are very generally convertible together, and ſo far there cannot be any diſtinction between them. But if any one or more languages ſhall be examined with the neceſſary attention, it may be found, perhaps, that the following principle operates with conſiderable influence on them all. Whenever the ſubject of a given propoſition ſhall happen to be the chief and primary object of our thoughts, a nominal ſentence will be generally employed; and, on the contrary, if our attention ſhall be more ſtrongly arreſted by the predicate, than it is by the ſubject of a given propoſition, we ſhall generally employ a verbal ſentence. If it be affirmed, for example, that "Such a man walked a certain diſtance within a given time," the attention of the hearer will be moſt powerfully directed to the action of the verb; and if it be affirmed, on the other hand, that "Such a man is the perſon who walked (or was the walker) "of a certain diſtance within a given time," the primary attention of the hearer will then be directed to the ſubject of the propoſition. Again; it may be accurately affirmed that "a man

"(was

" (we know not what man) walked from London to York " within a given time," but we muſt know and define the man, before we can affirm the ſame fact by having recourſe to the aid of a nominal ſentence. We might certainly ſay that " a man " who is known to you and me was the perſon who performed " this pedeſtrian exploit;" but it would be nonſenſe (except as *man* is oppoſed to *woman* or to other animals) to ſay that " a man " (we know not what man) was the perſon who performed it."

Now I conceive there can be no reaſon but that which I have ſtated, (namely, that the ſubject of a nominal ſentence is the chief and primary object of our attention,) why this fact may not be accurately conveyed by having recourſe to the aid of a nominal ſentence; and that it may be conveyed by having recourſe to the aid of a verbal ſentence ſeems to me to be a convincing proof that the attention of the ſpeaker and of the hearer is moſt powerfully directed, in a verbal ſentence, to the predicate and not to the ſubject of the propoſition. Accordingly the ſubject or agent of a verbal ſentence will be often wholly indefinite in every language; *firſt*, when the verb is uſed in the paſſive voice; as when we ſay that " a certain perſon was robbed," without ſtating who was the robber; and *ſecondly*, when the verb is uſed in the active voice; as in the following example: " The public have expreſſed their approbation or diſapprobation of ſuch a meaſure;" in which the word *public* has obtained an acceptation ſo perfectly indefinite, that every dabbler in politics believes himſelf at liberty to dignify with that appellation, a few obſcure individuals who may happen to coincide in opinion with himſelf. The truth then ſeems to be, that we often take no pains to define the ſubject of a verbal ſentence, becauſe our buſineſs, in this caſe, is not ſo much with the *ſubject* as it is with the *predicate* of a given propoſition; and that we take pains to define the ſubject of a nominal ſentence, becauſe it is generally the chief and primary object of our thoughts.

There is no doubt, however, that many examples might be adduced, in which the attention of the hearer will be equally directed to the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition; and, in this caſe, it is probable that the ſubject muſt be generally defined by ſome means or other, and that the propoſition may then be accurately conveyed, as well by a nominal as a verbal ſentence.

The preceding ob ſervations are merely intended as an attempt (perhaps very unſucceſsful) to ſuggeſt the probable cauſe of what I conceive to be a very ſingular principle of Arabic Grammar, which has never hitherto been well explained. They are, I believe, more accurately applicable to Arabic idiom, than they are to the idiom of the Engliſh or of the Perſian language; and as I am well aware that they were not neceſſary in this work, ſo, the errors into which they may have led me are unreluctantly ſubmitted as a prey to ſatiate the rapacious appetite of critical ſeverity. I now return to the more immediate ſubject of this chapter.

In conſidering the application of the فَاعِل to the purpoſes of ſpeech, there are three things which naturally demand the attention of the learner: *firſt*, the rules which determine the poſition of the فَاعِل in the ſtructure of a ſentence; *ſecondly*, the rules which determine its occaſional omiſſion; and, *finally*, the rules which determine its concord with a given verb. Each of theſe points are diſcuſſed in the following rules.

RULE FIRST.

The فَاعِل ſhould be the firſt word in every ſentence; and, in caſe of the occurrence of a ſentence in which either of two ſubſtantive nouns might be the فَاعِل, the firſt of theſe nouns, will aſſume that character by the influence of its poſition in the ſtructure of the ſentence. Examples: مردى بشيرى كشت " A " man

"man killed a tyger;" شیری مردی کشت "A tyger killed a man;" &c. It is to be obſerved, however, that the termination را will be almoſt invariably inſerted after the مفعول, in all examples of this nature: as مردی شیری را کشت; شیری مردی را کشت; &c.

RULE SECOND.

In poetry, or in any kind of proſe, if the abſence of this natural order ſhall not be the occaſion of producing obſcurity, the فاعل may yet be inſerted any where. Example: زبیخودی طلب یار می کند حافظ "Urged by inſanity (the inſanity "of love,) Hafiz perſiſts in the purſuit of his miſtreſs;" چو مفلسی که طلب کار گنج قارون است "Like a beggar who deſires to "poſſeſs the treaſures of Karoon." I ſhall not encumber the work by the multiplication of examples of this nature; becauſe the Perſian language admits of the utmoſt latitude of arrangement that can be conceived or deſired: as حافظ طلب یار می کند; طلب یار حافظ می کند; طلب یار می کند حافظ; می کند حافظ طلب یار; می کند طلب یار حافظ; &c. The natural order ſhould, however, be invariably preſerved, unleſs there ſhall be ſome good reaſon for ſetting it aſide.

RULE THIRD.

In a ſentence which contains a relative pronoun, there will be, of neceſſity, two verbs; and the ſame antecedent may be the nominative to both; or the accuſative to both, or the ظرف to both; or the nominative to the one and the accuſative to the other; or vice verſa; &c. &c. as already detailed in the chapter which treats of relative pronouns. With the nominative alone we have to do at preſent; and the rules which are applicable to it in this caſe, having already been detailed in that chapter,

need not be repeated in this place. In the following example from the poet حالی, the word راز, which is the accusative to the verb comprised in the relative clause, is the nominative to that which occurs in the predicate of the proposition.

راز سر بسته که خاصان نکشودند بهم   از کجا آمد و چون در دهن عام فتاد

"Whence comes the mystery which the learned were unable to "solve; and how has it become known to vulgar minds!"

RULE FOURTH.

Of the conditional sentence, that is to say, of a sentence comprising a شرط or conditional member, and a جزا which denotes the consequence flowing from the شرط, I shall have occasion to treat more fully hereafter. In the mean time, it is enough to observe, that it must comprise of necessity two verbs; and that the same noun may be at once the nominative to both verbs, or the nominative to either and the accusative to the other; &c. &c. In the following example, the noun پیشه ور happens to be the nominative to both verbs, and follows both in the structure of the sentence; which must be considered, however, as an unusual arrangement more adapted to poetry than it is to prose.

گر بغریبی رود از شهر خویش   سختی و محنت نبرد پیشه ور

"A sewer of garments, (a man who has a profession by "which he can earn his livelihood) if he goes into exile, will "yet experience no hardship."

RULE FIFTH.

It is a rule common to every language, that the فاعل or AGENT may be omitted on certain occasions; as for example, when we employ the verb in the passive voice, without stating or desiring to state, or perhaps without knowing the name of the person by whose agency the event which we contemplate was

carried

carried into effect.* Example: زَیدْ کُشْتَه شُدْ; "ZYDE was "killed;" &c. It is wholly unnecessary to multiply examples of this nature; but the following is the principle on which the omission of the فَاعِل, in all such cases, must necessarily depend. *First*, It may happen that we do not know, or knowing, that we have no desire to communicate the name of the agent of a given verb; and, in this case, the verb will be generally employed in the passive voice as already explained in the preceding example. Or, *secondly*, it may happen that there is something in the sentence which we utter, or in the circumstances under which it is uttered, that will enable the hearer to determine the agent; and, in this case, the verb may be alone employed in the active voice; as آمَدْ. "He is come;" in answer to the question آیَا زَیدْ آمَدْ "Is ZYDE come?" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

THE omission of the فَاعِل in certain cases, may yet depend on the particular idiom of a given tongue; and, in the Persian language, it will be accordingly, and perhaps invariably omitted, if the nominative shall be the AGENTS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE, to whose ministry is committed the conduct of all sublunary affairs. The examples of its omission in this case are numerous beyond all calculation; but one will be sufficient for every useful purpose.

دَرْ کُوْیِ نِیکْ نَامِی مَا رَا گُذَرْ نَدَادَنْدْ گَرْ تُو نِمِی پَسَنْدِی تَغْیِیرْ کُنْ قَضَا رَا

"THEY (THE MINISTERS OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE) have barred "against me the road that leads to a fair and spotless reputation; "O you, who are offended at my backslidings, change, I pray "you, the decrees of fate."*

RULE

* I have already had occasion to remark that the ZAUHIDS or DEVOTEES are the continual objects of the poetical enmity of HAFIZ and of all the SOOFEES; and to them it is, that HAFIZ

RULE SEVENTH.

Or, if the nominative to a given verb ſhall be a جمع غیر معیّن that is to ſay, the word *people*, when that word is uſed without an

---

Hafiz has addreſſed the ſaucy verſes quoted in the text. "You admit," he means to *ſay*, "*the doctrine of predeſtination*, which is taught in the text of the Kooraun itſelf; "*and does it not follow as a conſequence of that* Doctrine, that however ſinful, however pol- "*luted is the life* which I lead, it muſt be aſcribed, not to the voluntary effect of my "own free choice, but to the reſiſtleſs influence of the Divine will, which predetermined "every action of my life. If the conduct of my life be ſuch, therefore, as to ſcandalize "the hypocritical ſanctity of your profeſſions, aſcribe the effect to its true cauſe; and "change, I pray you, the decrees of Providence, which is alike the author of my vices, "and of the virtues which you have the preſumption to arrogate to yourſelves." Were theſe the ſentiments of a Moohummudan infidel, they would not ſtand in need of any comment; but though I think there is much reaſon to ſuſpect the orthodoxy of certain Philosophers among the Oriental nations, I have never been able to conſider the Soofees in any other light than as a ſect of the moſt ardent fanatics in religion. Their doctrines, however, have, I believe, a ſtrong reſemblance to thoſe of Spinosa; and like his, would probably be found to lead directly to Materialiſm, or perhaps to Atheiſm itſelf, if cloſely examined by the cool and diſcriminating judgment of a European reaſoner. It is infinitely beyond the powers of my underſtanding to give a conſiſtent and connected account of the doctrines of the Soofees; yet ſuch an account is by much the greateſt deſideratum in Perſian literature. They certainly aſſert their belief in the Kooraun; yet the principles which they profeſs have no apparent conſiſtency with the doctrines taught in that book. The deity, according to them, ſeems to be the author of all religions, (as indeed he is the author of every thing elſe;) from which it certainly follows as a corrollary, that one religion is as good as another. As to the precepts taught in the Kooraun, though perfect in themſelves, they are ſuppoſed by the Soofees to have a myſtical ſenſe, which lies much deeper than the literal meaning of the word would ſeem to imply. A Zauhid may be deſcribed as a perſon who follows the dictates of the Kooraun according to the obvious and literal acceptation of the words in which theſe dictates are conveyed; and ſuch a perſon has been ſtigmatiſed among the Soofees by the term اہل صورت *A man who ſkims the ſurface of things.* A Soofee is equally bound to follow the precepts taught in the Kooraun; but then he is an اہل معنی, he has penetrated the myſtery to the very bottom; and has manufactured a ſyſtem of his own, which does not apparently retain a ſingle feature of the work with which it is ſaid to coincide. The entire harmony between them will nevertheleſs be affirmed by a true Soofee; and our inability to perceive it, will furniſh, in his mind, a proof of the dulneſs of our intellects, of what he will term our دل مردگی, but not of the errors of his own ſyſtem. It is neceſſary to add that the Soofees permit themſelves to talk of wine and women with the utmoſt freedom; (becauſe their conceptions, they ſay, cannot be otherwiſe expreſſed than by the means of metaphor, that is to ſay, of figures borrowed from the objects of ſenſe;) but not, in my opinion,

an article; as "People ſay;" "People think;" &c. &c. the verb will be put into the third perſon plural, and the nominative will then be wholly omitted. Example: گفته اند ; آورده اند "It has been ſaid;" گویند "It is ſaid;" لقمان را پرسیدند که ادب از که آموختی "LOOKMAUN was aſked," or "They aſked LOOKMAUN, of whom he had learnt propriety of conduct:" &c. In ſuch examples as theſe, we are moſt commonly ignorant of the true nominative to a given verb; for the word *people*, when uſed without an article, conveys no information which is not compriſed in the following verb. But though we are not ignorant of the nominative, it may yet be often elegantly omitted when the context ſhall enable us to ſupply it with eaſe; as in the following example in which عمر خیام, a SOOFEE poet, has attacked, with their own weapons, the public teachers of the law of MOOHUMMUD.

---

opinion, to practiſe debauchery of any kind. I do not mean to ſay that no SOOFEE has ever committed vice; the aſſertion would be wholly incredible; but merely to ſtate that they are a ſect of fanatics who believe in the truth of their own creed, notwithſtanding the intermixture of much abſurdity as well as ſublimity, in which it abounds. Of the tendency of their creed (if it has any tendency) to the atheiſtical ſyſtem of the celebrated SPINOSA, it is very poſſible that they may not be aware. The doctrine of predeſtination ſeems to have confounded all their faculties; and among the Hindoos, who are ſuppoſed to have been the firſt inventors of the SOOFEE ſyſtem, (the ſyſtem alſo of PLATO according to the opinion of Oriental writers) it may have been the reſult of a deſire to reconcile this doctrine of predeſtination with the received opinions of the goodneſs of GOD. GOD, however, according to the SOOFEES I believe, and certainly according to ſome Oriental writers, is himſelf a neceſſary agent; and the attributes of ſeverity and of mercy, of love, and of wrath, &c. are deemed to be mere human paſſions, which can have no exiſtence in his mind.

The queſtion that relates to the oppoſite doctrines of LIBERTY and NECESSITY, is probably of a nature too high to be ſucceſsfully canvaſſed by the reaſoning powers of *any* order of created beings.

> Others apart ſat on a hill retir'd,
> In thoughts more elevate; and reaſoned high,
> Of Providence, fore knowledge, will, and fate,
> Fixed fate, free will, fore knowledge abſolute;
> *And found no end in wandering mazes loſt.*

I believe, however, that a view of the ſtate of ſociety in the Eaſtern world might furniſh many ſtrong arguments againſt the adoption of the doctrine of NECESSITY as a popular creed among the nations of the earth.

گویند که فردوس برین خواهد بود آنجا می ناب و حور عین خواهد بود

گر ما می و معشوق گزیدیم چه باک چون عاقبت کار همین خواهد بود

"Paradise they tell us (that is, the اهل شرع or *public* "*teachers of the Law* tell us) is a delightful abode; it abounds "in pure wine; and there, alſo, are the large eyed Houras diſtined "to bleſs us in their happy embraces. If I then have choſen "my beloved, and have not abſtained from the pleaſures of wine, "where, I aſk, is the harm in doing that now, which at the "laſt is to be done?"

RULE EIGHTH.

If the nominative or agent to a given verb ſhall be of the rational ſpecies, and of the plural number, the verb muſt be alſo put into the plural. Example: یاران رفتند "My friends are gone;" و مرا برنج گذاشتند. "And have left me in ſorrow;" &c. The exceptions to this rule are of rare occurrence, and are never to be found except in poetry. Example from Haufiz: الا ای همنشین دل که یارانت برفت از یاد "O thou companion of my heart whoſe friends are wholly forgotten by thee!" &c.

RULE NINTH.

If there ſhall be two or more nominatives to a given verb, connected together by copulative conjunctions, the verb muſt be put into the plural number, if the nouns ſhall be the names of rational beings. Examples: زید و عمر آمدند "Zyde and Amr came;" بکر و خالد رفتند. Bukr and Khalid went away;" &c. If the nouns thus connected together, ſhall be of various perſons, the verb will aſſume the firſt perſon before the ſecond; and the ſecond perſon before the third. Example: باید که تو و اهل مملکت تو بزودی بروید. "It is neceſſary "that

" that you and the people of your kingdom ſhould quickly go;" &c. There are few exceptions to this rule; that is to ſay, there are few of the caſes ſtated in it, in which the verb will not aſſume the plural number; and theſe are chiefly or entirely to be found among the poets.

EXAMPLE.

محتشم وار بهر جا که شد آن شه روزا همه جا عاشق و درویش و گدا پیش آمد
کمال

RULE TENTH.

If the agent, being the name of a rational being, ſhall be multiplied by the aid of a noun of number, the verb will be generally put into the plural number. Example: ده مرد توانا کمان او را زه نکردندی " Ten ſtrong men could not have bent his bow." The exceptions to this rule are pretty numerous, and more eſpecially in the caſe of the ſubſtantive verb; but the nominative, in this caſe, will be the مبتدا not the فاعل, becauſe the propoſition will conſiſt of three terms. The verb است has, however, a double ſenſe; and if it be uſed as a perfect verb in the following example, the nominative will then be the فاعل or agent.

در غنچهٔ هنوز و صدت عندلیب است

" You are ſtill in the bloſſom and already you have, (or there exiſt for you,) a hundred lovers."

RULE ELEVENTH.

If the agent ſhall be a collective noun denoting a collection or multitude of rational beings, the verb will generally retain the ſingular; but the plural number may yet be aſſumed according to the option of every ſpeaker. Example: خلق می گوید or " خلق می گویند The multitude ſay;" &c.

RULE

RULE TWELFTH.

If the agent ſhall be the name of a rational being following the word همه, *all*, or any of its ſynonimes, it will itſelf moſt commonly retain the ſingular number, but the verb will generally aſſume the plural. Example: همه کس آمدند " All the people came;" &c. But the word همه is ſometimes, though rarely, uſed in the ſenſe of هر *every*; and, in this caſe, the verb will retain the ſingular number.

EXAMPLE.

همه کس روز بهي مي طلبد زين ايام مشکل اين است که هر روز بتري بينيم

حافظ

" Every man complains of his unfortunate condition in " this age of human miſery, yet each day brings with it ſome " new evil to be added to thoſe of the preceding day."

RULE THIRTEENTH.

If the agent ſhall be the name of a rational being following the word هر *every*, or any of its ſynonimes, the verb will generally retain the ſingular number. Example: هرکه سنگت زند شکر بخشش " Return good for evil;" literally, " Give ſugar to him who " pelts you with ſtones." But the word هر or هریک is ſometimes, though rarely, uſed in the ſenſe of همه *all*, and in this caſe the verb will aſſume the plural number.

EXAMPLE.

هریک از دایرهٔ جمع براهی رفتند ما بماندیم و خیال تو بیک جای مقیم

سعدی

" All have quitted the circle of the aſſembly; and I alone, " accompanied by the idea of you which never leaves me, remain " immoveable in perplexity and grief."

RULE FOURTEENTH.

If the agent ſhall be the name of a rational being, connected with other nouns by the intervention of the particle با *with*, or by the intervention of any ſimilar particle, the verb will retain the ſingular number. Example: زَیْد بَا عَمْر آمَد "Zyde came with Amr;" &c. In modern language the verb, in this caſe, is frequently found to aſſume the plural number; but I conceive this form of conſtruction to be inſufficiently eſtabliſhed by unexceptionable authority; and it is therefore inelegant in all probabilty.

EXAMPLE.

قَاضِی بَا مَرْدُمَان اَزْ هَلَاکِ اُو خَاطِر جَمْع کَرْدَه بَازْ گَشْتَنْد
رفیع واعظ

"The judge with his people returned home after having "put this man to death."

RULE FIFTEENTH.

The laſt ſeven rules regard the concord, in point of number, between a given verb and an agent which denotes the name of a rational being. If the agent ſhall denote the name of an animal not rational, theſe rules will be ſtill applicable with diminiſhed force; that is to ſay, the number of exceptions to each rule will be conſiderably augmented. Perhaps, in ſome caſes, the exceptions may be equally numerous with the examples which corroborate the application of the rule. Examples: اَسْبَان رَسِیدَنْد, very rarely اَسْبَان رَسِید. "The horſes are come;" اَسْبْ و گَاو رَسِیدَنْد, rarely اَسْبْ و گَاو رَسِید "The horſes and cattle arrived;" دُو اَسْب رَسِیدَنْد or دُو اَسْب رَسِید "Two horſes are come;" (equally accurate;) رَمهٔ گُوسْپَنْد رَسِید, rarely رَمهٔ گُوسْپَنْد رَسِیدَنْد "A flock

"A flock of sheep or goats are come;" قسه گاو آمدند or قسه گاو آمد "All the cattle are arrived;" (equally accurate;) هر مرغ پرید rarely هر مرغ پریدند "Every bird," or "All the birds flew away;" گاو با بچه رسید, very seldom گاو با بچه رسیدند "The cow is come with her calf; &c.

RULE SIXTEENTH.

If the agent ſhall be the name of an inanimate object in the plural number, and more eſpecially, if it ſhall aſſume the animate form of the plural in ان, the verb may aſſume the plural number. The ſingular number will yet be moſt commonly retained in this caſe; and more eſpecially if the noun ſhall aſſume the plural in ها, or any form of the Arabic plural. Examples: درختان شگفت or درختان شگفتند "The trees have bloſſomed;" گلهای چمن بر باد شدند, or in the words of JAMEE, گلهای چمن بباد رفت "The flowers of the garden have paſſed away;" رسید مژده که ایام غم نخواهد ماند "The joyful tidings have been received that the ſeaſon of grief (literally the days of grief) will paſs away;" &c.

RULE SEVENTEENTH.

If the agent, being the name of an inanimate object, ſhall be connected with others by the intervention of copulative conjunctions, the verb may aſſume either number but the ſingular number will be generally retained. Examples: ربود غارت دل و جان عارض و لبت "Your beauty has deprived my ſoul of reſt;" لاله و سنبل او تازه و تر باز آمد "Its tulip and hyacinths have reſumed their verdure." The ſame rule is applicable, when the agent of the verb ſhall happen to be multiplied by means of a noun of number. Examples: این دو چشم مرا بر گشته انگیخت or in the language of SAUDEE, انگیختند

اين دو چيزم بر گناه انگيختند "These two things have excited me to sin;" &c. And in every other case but those stated in this and the preceeding rule, the singular number will be almost invariably retained after an agent denoting the name of an inanimate object.

RULE EIGHTEENTH.

The word اهل and other words of the same nature, when followed by a given substantive noun, will form an attribute applicable to rational beings: as اهل تقوى "The pious;" اهل صفا "The pure;" اهل دولت "The great, noble, fortunate;" &c. This word, when so used, generally requires the verb to be in the plural number: as اهل تقوى چنين گويند "The pious say;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

I have nothing more to remark on the nature and application of the فاعل to the purposes of speech. This noun is very nearly connected with the مبتدا, and the rules of concord which I have applied to either, are no doubt equally applicable to both. Their insertion under both heads is indeed distinguished by nothing but the difference of arrangement, or the additional information which, under the last head, farther reflexion has enabled me to supply.

The following observation should be made somewhere, and may be as well inserted here as any where else; though it is equally applicable to every part of this book. An opinion is generally entertained that Grammar should be seldom or never indebted for an example to the language of the poets; because the language of poetry differs, in every country, from that of prose. I believe the difference between them to be very inconsiderable, and to consist chiefly in the inverted arrangement of words which

takes

takes place in poetry; a ſubject of little or no importance in the Perſian Language. For example: The rules of concord which are applicable to proſe are unqueſtionably applicable to poetry alſo; as well in the Perſian, as in every other tongue. I conceive, therefore, that Grammar may be very reaſonably indebted for its examples to the language of the Poets, and I have accordingly not ſcrupled to have recourſe to their authority on every occaſion. Examples drawn from the Poets have this advantage, that the meaſure of the verſe generally prevents the poſſibility of diſputing their accuracy, which might be eaſily diſputed if they were ſelected from the writings of an author in proſe. Thus the meaſure of the following verſe neceſſarily requires that the word طَلَبَد ſhould preſerve the ſingular number هَمَه كَس رُوزِ بِهِي مِي طَلَبَد زِين اَيَّام; whereas it would be doubtful, if the ſame expreſſions had occurred in proſe, whether the ſingular had not been erroneouſly ſubſtituted by the tranſcriber for the plural number.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

مَفْعُول مَا لَمْ يُسَمَّ فَاعِلُهُ

OR

NOMINATIVE TO A VERB IN THE PASSIVE VOICE.

The nominative to a verb in the paſſive voice is invariably the ſame noun which forms the accuſative or object to the tranſitive verb; and hence it is known to the Arabian Grammarians by the term مَفْعُول مَا لَمْ يُسَمَّ فَاعِلُهُ, that is to ſay, "The object to a verb of which the agent is not expreſſed." The agent however may doubtleſs be accurately expreſſed, as when we affirm that "James was beaten by John;" &c. but the agent, which is the nominative to the active verb, will never be the nominative to the paſſive verb; and this is probably all that is meant by the

Arabian

Arabian Grammarians, though it is alſo true that the agent ſeldom accompanies an Arabic or a Perſian verb in the paſſive voice. The nominative to a paſſive verb is ſometimes termed قائم مقام فاعل "The ſubſtitute of the agent;" becauſe the grammatical character of both is exactly the ſame: that is to ſay, the one is the nominative to an active verb, as the other is the nominative to a paſſive verb. When we aſſirm for example, that "JAMES loveth JOHN," it is clear that JOHN, the object of the active verb, will become the nominative to the paſſive verb; as "JOHN is loved by JAMES," and other examples of the ſame nature.

BUT certain verbs, in every language, require to be followed by two or more objects, as when we affirm that "JAMES preſented a horſe to JOHN;" and in this caſe, it will depend on the idiom of a given language, which of theſe nouns ſhall be the nominative to the verb in the paſſive voice. The idiom of the Arabic Language neceſſarily requires that the ſecond object of the tranſitive verb ſhall be invariably ſelected for that purpoſe; as أعطى زيدٌ بكراً فرساً "ZYDE preſented a horſe to BUKR;" أُعطيَ بكرٌ فرساً "BUKR was preſented with a horſe;" &c. The idiom of the Perſian Language neceſſarily requires the ſelection of the firſt object in every example of this nature; as زید اسپی را به بکر بخشید "ZYDE preſented a horſe to BUKR;" اسپی به بکر بخشیده شد "A horſe was preſented to BUKR;" &c. And the idiom of the Engliſh Language admits the ſelection of either noun; ſince it ſeems to be a matter of no importance whether we ſay that "The horſe was preſented to ZYDE;" or that "ZYDE was preſented with the horſe."

IT may be inferred therefore that the firſt object of every tranſitive verb, whether that object ſhall be a ſimple ſubſtantive noun or the ſenſe of a ſentence, (for many verbs are obviouſly tranſitive to the ſenſe of a ſentence) will be invariably ſelected, in the Perſian Language, to form the nominative to a verb in the paſſive

voice. And hence it follows that the ſentence following the particle کہ *That*, will be aſſumed as the nominative to the paſſive verb in the following and other examples of the ſame nature: زید با بکر فرمود که شرط خدمت بجا آرد "ZYDE ordered BUKR to perform the duties of ſervice;" با بکر فرموده شد که شرط خدمت بجا آرد "Orders were given to BUKR that he ſhould perform the duties of ſervice," or "The performance of theſe duties was impoſed upon BUKR."—* The idiom of the Engliſh Language generally leads us, in this caſe, to aſſume the word BUKR as the nominative to the verb in the paſſive voice: "BUKR was ordered to perform the duties of ſervice;" a mode of conſtruction which is altogether inadmiſſible in the Perſian Tongue.

WHEN we affirm that "ZYDE *knew, found, thought*, or *believed*, AMR to be wiſe or virtuous," &c. there are two modes in which the ſentiment may be accurately expreſſed in the Perſian Language, whether by the aid of an active or a paſſive verb. *Firſt*, it may be expreſſed by having recourſe to a ſentence following the particle کہ *That*; and this mode of conſtruction is the moſt common; as زید دانست که عمرو داناست "ZYDE knew AMR to be wiſe;" دانسته شد که عمرو داناست "It became known that AMR is wiſe;" or, *ſecondly*, the *Muſder* or the *Haſile Muſder* may be accurately employed in this caſe; a mode of conſtruction which is much leſs common than the former among the writers of Perſia.

* It is to be obſerved that the particle کہ *That*, when prefixed to the tenſes of a given verb, has the effect of converting thoſe tenſes into the ſenſe of the infinitive or the *Haſilè Muſder*; that is to ſay, into the ſenſe of the infinitive or its correſponding ſubſtantive noun. For whether we ſay, "It was requeſted of BUKR *that he ſhould perform* a given duty," or "*The performance* of a given duty was requeſted of BUKR," or "It was requeſted of BUKR (BUKR was requeſted) *to perform* a given duty," it is obvious that the ſenſe is the ſame in every caſe. And hence it may be inferred that the regimen of a given ſentence following the particle کہ *That*, is preciſely the ſame with the regimen of a ſimple ſubſtantive noun; or, in other words, that either is ſuſceptible of the ſame grammatical characters which are applicable to the other, ſince either may be the agent or the object of a given verb; &c. &c.

Examples;

Examples: زید دانائی عمرو دانست "Zyde knew the wisdom of Amr;" دانائی عمرو دانسته شد "The wisdom of Amr became known;" &c. It should be observed that though the idiom of the English Language admits the assumption of Amr as the nominative to the verb in the passive voice, "Amr was known to be wise;" the same form of construction is wholly inadmissible in the Persian Tongue.

It sometimes happens that either of two nouns may be indifferently assumed as the first (the other being the second) object of a transitive verb; as when we affirm that "The minister appointed a certain person to a given office;" or "that he appointed, that is to say gave, the office to a certain person." Both these forms of speech are indiscriminately employed in the Persian Language; though it is more respectful perhaps, in speaking of an officer of state, to say that an office was appointed or given to him, than it would be to say that "he was appointed to a given office." In this case, the office or the person may indifferently become the nominative to the verb in the passive voice. Examples: زید بکر را بخدمت سفارت مقرر کرد "Zyde appointed Bukr to the office of ambassador;" زید خدمت سفارت را به بکر مقرر کرد "Zyde appointed or gave the office of ambassador to Bukr;" بکر بخدمت سفارت مقرر کرده شد "Bukr was appointed to the office of ambassador;" خدمت سفارت به بکر مقرر کرده شد "The office of ambassador was appointed or given to Bukr;" &c. Among the later Persian writers, some examples may be observed of the retention, after the nominative to a verb in the passive voice, of that preposition or termination which marks the object of the transitive verb: as زید را بخدمت سفارت مقرر کرده شد "Zyde was appointed to the office of ambassador." But this mode of construction is of rare occurrence, and it seems to me that of the termina-

tion

tion را (زید را), or the preposition به (بخدمت), the one or the other should be omitted as erroneous*.

THE فاعل or AGENT seldom accompanies a Persian verb in the passive voice; or, if it should be expressed, it will generally require the intervention of a substantive noun between itself and the preposition with which it is connected. We cannot, for example, say in the Persian Language that "ZYDE was killed by AMR;" for the words زید از عمر کشته شد would be absolute nonsense: but we may accurately say زید از دست عمر کشته شد "ZYDE was killed by the hand of AMR;" زید از شمشیر عمر کشته شد "ZYDE was killed by the sword of AMR;" because the required substantive noun (دست or شمشیر) intervenes here between the agent and the preposition with which it is connected.

* In the following example from the *Bahauré Daunish*, I believe the insertion of the termination را after مطلبی, (مطلبی را) may be accounted for, on the supposition that the word مطلبی, followed by the relative clause of the sentence, forms the accusative or object of the verb دانست. In this case, the sense of the sentence will run thus: "BE NUZEER perceiving that her curiosity was excited to the uttermost, and (perceiving also) the object which he had in view, *(that it) was leavened* or *accomplished*, cunningly represented," &c. The words "perceiving the object that it was accomplished," mean merely, "perceiving that the object was accomplished;" and this form of construction is of common occurrence in the Persian Language. If this explanation shall not be admitted, it must, I suppose, be inferred that the word مطلبی is the nominative to the verb مخمر شده *was leavened* or *accomplished*, in the passive voice; in which case, the termination را had better have been omitted in my opinion. But no well informed native will admit that there is here any inaccuracy in the insertion of that termination, and I do not know that we have any right to dogmatise on the subject. The following is the example to which I allude:—

بی نظیر چون دانست که شوق در کمال استیلا است و مطلبی را که درین ضمن
مطمح نظر دارد مخمر شده از روی عیاری بعرض رسانید که

THE

The rules that regard the poſition or the omiſſion of the فاعل, as well as its concord with a given verb, are equally applicable to the مفعول مالم يسم فاعله; and need not therefore be repeated in this place. I now proceed to detail the rules that relate to the مفعول به or PROPER OBJECT OF A TRANSITIVE VERB.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

SECTION FIRST.

مفعول به

OR

OBJECT OF AN ACTIVE AND TRANSITIVE VERB.

The مفعول به has been defined, by the Arabian Grammarians, to be that noun to which a verb is tranſitive; or that noun which ſuffers the action of a tranſitive verb. Now a verb may be tranſitive in its own right; as when we ſay of Zyde, that "He hath beaten Bukr;" or, being naturally intranſitive, it may yet become tranſitive by the means of certain prepoſitions; as "The hounds *run down* the hare;" "The birds *flew through* (or pierced) the air;" and other examples of the ſame nature. If the reader ſhould be of opinion that the verbs here noticed are *not* rendered tranſitive to the following ſubſtantive nouns, by means of the prepoſitions with which they are connected, I ſhall be well diſpoſed to concede the point in diſpute between us; *firſt*, becauſe I am not abſolutely certain of the accuracy of the propoſition here ſtated; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe I wiſh to conſider, in this chapter, the objects of thoſe verbs only, which are admitted to be tranſitive in their own right. For there is not, perhaps, a ſingle verb of the tranſitive or intranſitive claſs, which does not require to be connected with various ſubſtantive nouns by means of the intervention of certain prepoſitions; as when we affirm of

an individual that "He slept *in* his bed last night," that is to say, *during* last night; or that "He arrived *at* the end of his journey this morning;" that is to say, *in* the morning; &c. &c. And as it would be absurd to affirm that the intransitive verbs here noticed are transitive to *any*, or to *all* the substantive nouns by which they are followed; so it will be convenient at least, though not perhaps unexceptionably accurate, to consider intransitive verbs as having no right to assume a transitive character on any occasion.

THE term مَفْعُول has been indifferently applied, by the Arabian Grammarians, to most of the substantive nouns of every kind that may happen to be connected with a given verb, whether transitive or otherwise; and the various species of nouns to which this term is deemed to be applicable, have been recognised by them to amount to the number of five; namely, *first*, the مَفْعُولٌ بِهِ or OBJECT OF A TRANSITIVE VERB; as ضَرَبْتُ زَيْدًا "I struck ZYDE;" *secondly*, the مَفْعُول مُطْلَق or UNIVERSAL OBJECT, which is supposed to be common to all verbs in the Arabic Language without exception; as ضَرَبْتُ ضَرْبًا "I beat (or gave) a beating;" *thirdly*, the مَفْعُول فِيهِ or that noun which denotes the name of A GIVEN TIME OR A GIVEN PLACE in which the action of a verb is stated to occur; as سَافَرْتُ شَهْرًا "I travelled *during* a month;" جَلَسْتُ فِي الدَّار "I sat down *in* the house;" *fourthly*, the مَفْعُولٌ لَهُ or that noun which denotes the CAUSE of the action of a given verb; as ضَرَبْتُهُ تَأْدِيبًا "I beat him for the purpose of correction," or "in order to correct him;" and, *finally*, the مَفْعُولٌ مَعَهُ or that noun which follows the particle وَ signifying *with*; as جِئْتُ أَنَا وَزَيْدًا "I came with ZYDE;" &c.*
In most of these examples (though not in them all) the مَفْعُول

* The مَفْعُولٌ لَهُ occurs not unfrequently in the Persian Language; as اِطِّلَاعًا بِعَرْض پَرْدَاخْتَم "I have represented this for your information;" &c.

is

is connected with its proper verb, not by the intervention of prepositions, but by the means of case; that is to say, by putting the nouns to which that term is applicable into the objective case. To this cause I am disposed to ascribe the fact which I have just now stated; *namely*, that the Arabian Grammarians have determined the term مَفْعُول or "object of the verb," to be applicable to them all.

In the Persian Language I propose to comprise under the term مَفْعُول; *first*, the مَفْعُول بِهِ or "OBJECT OF A TRANSITIVE VERB," which forms the subject of the present section of this chapter; and, *secondly*, the مَفْعُول مُطْلَق or "UNIVERSAL OBJECT," which will be the subject of discussion in another section. Most of the other nouns to which I have adverted may be classed promiscuously under the general term صِلَه, or *nouns connected with the verb;* and as the idiom of the Persian Language generally requires that this connexion should be established by means of prepositions, so the *sense* of those prepositions will sufficiently determine the nature of the relation that may exist between them. It follows therefore that the consideration of the صِلَه may be altogether omitted in this part of the work; *first*, because the nature of the relation existing between them and a given verb must be necessarily determined by the sense of the preposition that may happen to be employed on a given occasion; and, *secondly*, because the sense of all the prepositions will be fully considered hereafter when we shall have occasion to treat of Persian Particles. The حَال, the تَمْيِيز and the بَدَل will, however, be considered by themselves.

The object of a transitive verb may be generally known to be that noun which is described by the passive participle of the same verb; as when we affirm that "ZYDE beateth BUKR;" in which case BUKR is described by the participle BEATEN; that is to say,

he

he is the perſon *beaten* by ZYDE. We muſt be careful however to add no prepoſition or other word to the paſſive participle of the tranſitive verb; becauſe it will often, in that caſe, become applicable to the صِلَه; that is to ſay, to other nouns beſides that noun to which the verb is tranſitive in the active voice. If it be affirmed, for example, that "ZYDE preſented (or gave) a horſe to BUKR;" the horſe is clearly *the thing given*; and conſequently the object of the tranſitive verb. BUKR is the perſon *to whom* (it is) *given*; and he is merely the صِلَه or noun connected with the verb; and not the true object of the verb, in the ſenſe in which the term "object" is now uſed.

IN the Perſian Language, the object of a tranſitive verb is often followed by the termination را; but that termination is alſo employed for other purpoſes; and its inſertion for the purpoſe here ſtated, namely, that of marking the object of a tranſitive verb, is by no means neceſſary, or even admiſſible, on every occaſion. The following are all the rules regarding the poſition, omiſſion or inſertion of the termination را, which I have been able to collect in the Perſian Language.

RULE FIRST.

WHEN the object of a tranſitive verb ſhall not be followed by an adjective, or by a ſubſtantive noun with which it is connected, the termination را, if it ſhall be expreſſed, will neceſſarily follow the object of the tranſitive verb. Example; فُلَان رَا دِیدَم "I ſaw ſuch a man;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

IF the object of the tranſitive verb ſhall be followed by an adjective, or by one or more ſubſtantive nouns with which it is connected, the termination را will generally follow theſe words. Example: زَید پِسَر فُلَان رَا دِیدَم "I ſaw ZYDE, the ſon of ſuch

ſuch a man." But in poetry, if the meaſure of the verſe require it, the termination را will ſometimes (though very rarely) occur between a ſubſtantive and the following adjective noun; or between one ſubſtantive and another with which, as an attributive, it may happen to be connected. Example: دوستان را متصل سازد ز یکدیگر جدا for دوستان متصل را ز یکدیگر جدا سازد "She (Fortune) ſeparates the friends that are near to each other." It is to be obſerved, however, that the word متصل is ſometimes adverbially uſed to ſignify همیشه *Conſtantly*, or *Always*; and if it be here ſo uſed, the ſenſe of the paſſage will ſtand as follows: "She (Fortune) conſtantly ſeparates mutual friends." Or the word متصل may be the حال, to which دوستان is the ذو الحال according to the explanation of thoſe terms, inſerted in a ſubſequent chapter of this work. In either of theſe caſes, the example in queſtion will be inſufficient to eſtabliſh the propoſition advanced in the rule: *namely*, that the particle را is ſometimes inſerted between a given ſubſtantive and the following adjective noun. And in truth I have ſome doubts with regard to the accuracy of this propoſition, of which, to ſay the leaſt, the examples are of very rare occurrence in the Perſian Language. Of the occurrence of the particle را between the مفعول به and the following *ſubſtantive* noun with which it is connected by the intervention of the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی, it would be eaſy to *make* an example, ſuch as زید پسر فلان را دیدم for زید را پسر فلان دیدم "I ſaw Zyde the ſon of ſuch a perſon;" but the introduction of را between زید and پسر is inadmiſſible in my opinion, becauſe I do not believe that it can be ſupported by a ſingle authority of claſſical eminence.

RULE THIRD.

If the مفعول به ſhall be one of a given tribe or multitude occurring before and after the prepoſition از, the termination را

 may

may then be accurately inserted after the مفعول به which occurs before that preposition; or after the generic name of such multitude which will be found to follow that preposition. The ancient writers of Persia, in every respect superior for elegance, purity and simplicity of style, to those who have written in modern times, have generally inserted the termination را immediately after the مفعول به. Example: یکی را از علما دیدم "I saw one of the learned." And the modern writers commonly insert that termination after the generic noun that may happen to follow the preposition از. Example: یکی از علما را دیدم "I saw one of the learned;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

If the مفعول به shall be followed by a parenthetical sentence occurring between it and the transitive verb with which it is connected, an ancient writer will generally insert the termination را immediately after the مفعول به. Example: یزید را لعنة الله علیه بخواب دیدند "They saw Yuzeed (the curse of God be upon him) in a dream." And in the writings of modern authors, the termination را will generally follow the parenthetical sentence. Example: علی رضی الله عنه را بخواب دیدم "I saw Alee (may God be satisfied with him) in a dream."

RULE FIFTH.

If the مفعول به shall be a ضمیر متصل or *Conjunctive Pronoun*, the insertion of را will be wholly inadmissible on every occasion. Examples: زیدم زد "Zyde beat me;" بکرت رهبری نمود "Bukr guided thee," or "Bukr was thy guide;" &c.

RULE

RULE SIXTH.

If the مفعول به ſhall be a ضمیر منفصل or *Disjunctive Pronoun*, the termination را muſt be invariably inſerted on every occaſion. Examples: مرا آورد "He brought me;" ترا زد "He beat thee;" &c. The ſame rule is applicable to the pronoun خود, as well as to the demonſtrative nouns, and to the word فلان, when theſe words (occurring in a ſentence as the مفعول به) ſhall be unaccompanied by common ſubſtantive nouns. Examples: خود را کشت "He killed himſelf;" آنرا دیدم "I ſaw that;" این را خریدم "I purchaſed this;" فلان را بخانه بردم "I carried ſuch a perſon to my houſe," &c. But if they ſhall happen to be followed by the common ſubſtantive nouns, as آن چیز ; فلان کس ; &c. the inſertion or omiſſion of the termination را will then depend on the rules (about to be detailed) which are applicable to common ſubſtantive nouns.

RULE SEVENTH.

If the مفعول به ſhall be a common ſubſtantive noun, the termination را will be generally inſerted, whenever the agent and the object of the verb ſhall both be the names of rational beings. Examples: زید بکر را کشت "Zyde killed Bukr;" زید کسی را نزد من فرستاد "Zyde ſent ſomebody to me;" &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

If the agent and the object of a given verb ſhall happen to be the names of animals not rational, the termination را will be generally inſerted. Example: گرگی گوسفندی را بدرید "A wolf tore a lamb;" &c.

RULE NINTH.

If the agent and the object of a given verb ſhall belong to the claſs of inanimated nouns, the termination را will be generally inſerted. Examples: بي قراري اشتياق شكيبائي را در ربود "The ardour of my attachment (or deſire to ſee you) has exhauſted my patience;" عشق عقل را بجنون آورد "Love has reduced reaſon to madneſs;" &c.

RULE TENTH.

Of the agent and the object of a given verb, either may be the name of a rational being, and the other may be the name of an animal not rational. In this caſe the termination را will be generally inſerted, if the verb ſhall denote an action of ſuch a nature as may poſſibly proceed from either noun. Examples: زيد شير را كشت "Zyde killed the tyger;" شير زيد را كشت "The tyger killed Zyde;" &c.

RULE ELEVENTH.

If the agent of the verb ſhall not belong to the claſs of animated beings, the termination را will be generally inſerted whenever the object ſhall be the name of an animal. Examples: افكار دنيوي زيد را كشت "Worldly cares deſtroyed Zyde;" خارش اسب را كشت "The itch killed the horſe;" &c.

RULE TWELFTH.

In the caſe of a verb denoting an action peculiar to rational beings, as *purchaſe* or *ſale*; the termination را will be generally omitted if the object ſhall be the name of an animal not rational; or of a ſlave, who forms like ſuch animals, a part of the property of his maſter. Examples: فلان غلام خريدم "I bought

bought such a slave;" زید اسب خود فروخت "ZYDE fold his horfe;" &c. The infertion, however, of the termination را, will be generally (and perhaps invariably) optional in this cafe.

RULE THIRTEENTH.

IF the agent of the verb fhall belong to the clafs of animated beings, the termination را will be very generally omitted when the object fhall not be the name of an animal. The examples of the operation of this rule are very numerous; the exceptions are comparatively fpeaking of rare occurrence; and the infertion of the termination را will clearly appear to be very inelegant, perhaps inaccurate, in moft, or at leaft in many cafes. Though that termination fhould be omitted, it is here inferted, after each example, between parenthefes; in order to fhew, by the effect of contraft, the impreffion refulting from its omiffion or utterance on a practifed ear. Generally fpeaking (though not certainly in every cafe) it cannot be uttered without exciting in the mind of a Perfian fcholar, a fenfation of diffonance not much unlike that which refults in mufic from a falfe concord: a clear proof that it muft be generally omitted. Examples: بی فایده هر که عمر (را) در باخت "Whoever fpends his life in vain;" چیزی (را) نخرید و زر (را) بینداخت "Has thrown away his money and purchafed nothing." ای پسر عقل و ادب (را) پیش گیر "O my fon learn wifdom and virtue;" و لهو و لعب (را) بگذار "And leave off idlenefs and vain purfuits;" که چون نعمت سپری شود سختی (را) بری و پشیمانی (را) خوری "For when your wealth fhall be expended, you will fuffer misfortunes and experience repentance;" سر (را) در بیابان نهاد و "He turned his face to the wildernefs;" و زمام اختیار (را) از دست داد "And dropt from his hand the reins of felf command." جامه (را) ندارم "I have no garment;"

garment;" وَامَن (رَا) اَزْکُجا آرم "Where then shall I find a lappet;" فَسیبِ دُشمن (را) مَخُور "Be not blind to the wiles of your enemies;" وَغُرُورِ مَدّاح (رَا) مَخَر "And beware of the pride inspired by the flatterer;" کِه آن دَامِ زَرْق (را) نِهَادَه "For the one has spread the snare of hypocrisy;" وَاین کَامِ طَمَع (را) گشَادَه "And the other has opened the mouth of avidity;" &c. &c. &c. The termination را is nevertheless inserted occasionally in this case. Example from JAUMEE: مُوجِب آن رَا پُرسِیدَم "I asked the cause of this." Many other examples might be adduced.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

If both nouns shall belong to the class of inanimated objects, the termination را will be generally omitted, whenever the object shall result from the agent, as every effect results from its cause. Examples: دَرَخت بَر (را) گرفت "The tree produced fruit;" مُلك اَزْخِرَدمَندان جَمَال (را) پَذِيرَد "A kingdom is improved by the administration of wise rulers." There are some exceptions to this rule, which forms, itself, an exception to the ninth rule.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

Those nouns (generally of the inanimate class) which are compounded with Persian auxiliaries, such as سَاختَن, کَرْدَن, نِمُودَن, &c. require the omission of the termination را: as غَارَت کَردَن *To plunder;* سُخَن کَرْدَن *To speak;* سَفَر کَرْدَن *To travel;* تَازِیَانَه زَدَن *To flog;* شَمْشِیر زَدَن *To strike with a sword;* رُوزَه دَاشتَن *To fast;* *&c, &c.* And the nouns connected with those compounded verbs, require occasionally the termination را; as زَید رَا غَارَت کَردَن "*To plunder* Zyde: or some of the prepositions; as بَا زَید غَدْر کَرْدَن *To practise treachery against*

against Zyde; &c. In the case of a verb requiring two objects, the termination را, or some of the prepositions, will be required to mark the first object; and the second object will admit of no adjunct of any kind. Example: زَيْدرا زر بَخْشِيدَم "I gave money to Zyde;" &c.

REMARKS.

It seems to me that the first component part of most compounded verbs, forms a species of the مَفْعُول مُطْلَق to any given auxiliary with which it may happen to be occasionally connected. And as the مَفْعُول مُطْلَق is never followed by the termination را, so these nouns also, require the omission of that termination. To explain by an example. The verb كَرْدَن signifies *To do* or *To perform;* that is to say, it denotes *action* of any kind. The word تَارَت on the contrary denotes *a specific action* signified by the word *plunder* in our Language; and hence it follows, that the compounded verb تَارَت كَرْدَن signifies "To perform the action of plunder;" that is to say, the term تَارَت is merely used to *specify* or *define* the general idea signified by the verb كَرْدَن *To do.* The idea signified by this verb is indeed so very general as to be applicable to all actions without exception; and the Arabian Grammarians have accordingly declared that the name of any action may be accurately compounded with this verb: as زَيْدٌ ضَرَبَ "Zyde beat;" زَيْدٌ فَعَلَ الضَّرْبَ "Zyde performed the action of beating;" &c. That the مَفْعُول مُطْلَق is often used to specify the *kind of action* signified by its own verb, is well known to every Arabic scholar; as جَلَسْتُ جِلْسَةً "I sat down *in a certain way;*" &c.

RULE SIXTEENTH.

If the same noun shall be respectively the agent and the object of two verbs, united together by the means of a conjuction, the government

government will be given to the neareſt verb. If that verb ſhall require the nominative, the termination را will be therefore omitted; and if the accuſative ſhall be required, the termination را will be generally inſerted. Examples: دوست را خواندم و نزد من آمد "I called my friend and he came accordingly;" زدم من وزد مرا زید "I beat Zyde and he beat me;" زد مرا وزدم من زید را "Zyde beat me and I beat him;" &c. I have often had occaſion to obſerve that the nominative is ſeldom the laſt member of a Perſian ſentence, and the two laſt examples are, in fact, more conſonant to Arabic than to Perſian idiom.

RULE SEVENTEENTH.

Every ſentence compriſing a Relative Pronoun muſt contain two verbs; of which the ſame antecedent may be the nominative to both, or the accuſative to both, or the nominative to either, and the accuſative to the other; &c. &c. as detailed in the chapter that treats of Relative Pronouns. If the ſame antecedent ſhall be the nominative to the firſt, and the accuſative to the ſecond verb, the termination را will be generally omitted after the antecedent; of which the pronominal name will be commonly expreſſed (though it may be omitted) in the predicate of the propoſition. Example: یاری که دلم برد دیدمش "The friend or miſtreſs who has poſſeſſion of my heart I have ſeen him or her;" or more rarely, یاری که دلم برد دیدم "The friend who has poſſeſſion of my heart I have ſeen." If the termination را ſhall be inſerted after the antecedent, the pronominal name of the latter muſt be neceſſarily omitted in the predicate of the propoſition. Example: یاری را که دلم برد دیدم "I ſaw the friend who has poſſeſſion of my heart." To ſay یاری را که دلم برد دیدمش would be obviouſly improper, becauſe the verb دیدم would then govern, at once, the antecedent itſelf and its pronominal name.

RULE

RULE EIGHTEENTH.

If the same antecedent shall be the accusative to the first verb, and the nominative to the second, the termination را will be generally inserted after the antecedent; of which the pronominal name will be most commonly omitted (though it may be inserted) in the predicate of the proposition. Example: دوستی را که بعمری فراچنگ آوردم بیکدم از دستم رفت ; (or, more rarely, او بیکدم از دستم رفت) "The friend whom I obtained in an age has been lost in a moment." If the termination را shall not be inserted after the antecedent, the pronominal name of the latter will be commonly inserted (though it may be omitted) in the relative clause. Example: یاری که می جستمش نزد من آمد (or more rarely یاری که می جستم نزد من آمد) "The friend whom I was looking for has come to me."

CONCLUSION.

The preceding are all the rules, regarding the insertion or omission of the termination را, that I have been able to collect in the Persian Language. They are applicable, only when that termination is employed to mark the object of a transitive verb; for if it shall be employed for any other purpose, (as یکی را حکایت کنند "They speak of a certain person;" هزار روپیه را اسپی خریدم "I purchased a horse for a thousand rupees;" &c. &c.) its insertion will be indespensibly necessary on every occasion; unless, indeed, we shall supply its place by the insertion of some other particle having the same, or nearly the same sense. The use of the termination را, when not employed to mark the object of a transitive verb, will be considered hereafter, when we have occasion to treat of Persian particles. In the mean time, I think it necessary to state some general principles which may, in my opinion, be accurately deduced from the preceding rules.

It muſt be obſerved that there are many exceptions to the ſeventh and following rules; but thoſe exceptions have not been detailed in this work, becauſe they may be generally referred to the following principle, which forms the baſis of all the rules: *namely*, that the inſertion of the termination را, though generally optional, is ſeldom neceſſary, but for the purpoſe of *diſpelling ſome obſcurity*, which the omiſſion of that termination might tend to create in the ſtructure of a ſentence. To explain by examples. It is certain that a man may kill a tyger, and that a tyger alſo may kill a man; or in other words, that either noun may be accurately aſſumed as the agent or object of the verb *To kill.* And hence it follows that the termination را muſt be inſerted in the following example: زَیْد شِیْر را کُشْت "Zyde killed the tyger;" becauſe it would be otherwiſe difficult to determine whether Zyde is the agent or the object of the verb. But if the verb ſhall aſſume the firſt perſon (شِیْری کُشْتَم "I killed a tyger;") or if our previous knowledge of things ſhall enable us with certainty to diſtinguiſh the agent from the object of a given verb, (گُرْگی گُوسْپَنْدی بِدَرِید "A wolf tore a lamb;") the omiſſion of the termination را will be optional to the ſpeaker in either caſe; becauſe it is of importance, only, to prevent obſcurity; and the means of its prevention are of no importance. I repeat, therefore, that the termination را muſt be inſerted in every doubtful caſe; and that the omiſſion of that termination is generally optional, and ſometimes neceſſary, whenever its omiſſion ſhall not be the cauſe of producing obſcurity in the ſtructure of a ſentence.

If, however, the termination را ſhall be omitted in oppoſition to the principle here ſtated; as زَیْد شِیْر کُشْت "Zyde killed the tyger;" it may yet be determined, on general principles, that the firſt noun (زید) is the nominative to the verb: becauſe the nominative is generally the firſt member of a Perſian ſentence.

ſentence. But as the Perſian Language admits of more latitude than moſt others, in the arrangement of the words compoſing a ſentence, ſo, this criterion is the moſt imperfect that can be imagined; and thoſe who deſire to attain perſpicuity of ſtyle, will do well to furniſh their readers with better means of diſcovering the ſenſe which they deſire to expreſs, than are to be drawn from the contemplation, ſimply, of the order of ſpeech. Having ſtated that the omiſſion of the termination را is generally optional, and ſome times neceſſary, whenever its omiſſion ſhall not be detrimental to the perſpicuity of a ſentence; it is obvious to obſerve that the term *optional* implies the liberty of inſerting the termination را, which will, accordingly, be often inſerted in ſuch caſes.

I NOW proceed to conſider the accordance of the rules which I have detailed, with that general principle, juſt mentioned, which is ſtated to form the baſis of them all.

ON reference to the SEVENTH, EIGHTH, and NINTH RULES, the reader will perceive that the termination را muſt be generally inſerted, whenever the agent and the object of a verb ſhall be ſubſtantive nouns of the ſame claſs. And thoſe rules are at once referable to the principle for which I contend; becauſe, of two given ſubſtantive nouns of the ſame claſs, it will generally happen that either may be accurately aſſumed as the agent or object of the ſame verb. If both nouns ſhall belong to the claſs of RATIONAL BEINGS, for example, it is clear that either may *love*, *hate*, *beat* or *kill*, the other, &c. &c. from which it follows that the omiſſion in this caſe of the termination را, would be generally productive of obſcurity in the ſtructure of the ſentence.

IF, on the contrary, the agent and the object of a given verb ſhall not be ſubſtantive nouns of the ſame claſs; as for example, if one ſhall be the name of A RATIONAL BEING, and the other of an ANIMAL NOT RATIONAL; the context will be often ſufficient to diſ-

tinguiſh

tinguish the agent from the object of the verb, without the aid of the termination را. But if it shall not be sufficient for that purpose, (as in the case stated in the TENTH RULE,) the termination را will then be inserted; and thus the TENTH RULE, tends to confirm the accuracy of the general principle to which I have now adverted. The same observations are applicable to the TWELFTH, THIRTEENTH and FOURTEENTH RULES; and, generally speaking, to all the exceptions from all the rules; since it will be found that the termination را is scarcely ever omitted, except in cases where its insertion is not required for the purpose of adding to the perspicuity of a sentence.

In such cases, it is to be expected that the insertion of this termination will be sometimes elegant, and sometimes optional or inadmissible. It will be elegant, for example, in the following proposition: گرگی گوسپندی را بدرید; because, though its insertion is not here necessary for the purpose of perspicuity, it is *generally* necessary for that purpose, in other propositions of the same class. And it will be at least inelegant, or perhaps inadmissible, in the following proposition: چون نعمت سیری شود تشنی را ابری; because its insertion is not necessary for the purpose of perspicuity, either in this proposition; or, generally speaking, in other propositions of the same class.

It only remains to account for the case stated in the ELEVENTH RULE: *namely*, that the termination را will be generally inserted in the following and other examples of the same nature: خارش اسب را کشت "The itch killed the horse;" &c. It must be admitted, that the omission in this case of the termination را, would not be generally the cause of producing obscurity in the structure of the sentence; and the necessity of its insertion must be therefore referred, in all probability, to another principle. It seems, according to reason, to be the province of animals to

perform

perform actions, and not the province of inanimate nouns: and if an inanimate noun ſhall be aſſumed as the agent to a verb, of which the object is the name of an animal, this is a perverſion of the order of nature, which muſt be marked by the inſertion of the termination را. The operation of this principle (plauſible at leaſt, if not convincing) is, in my judgment, ſtrongly confirmed by the following obſervation: namely, that the termination را muſt be generally omitted (ſee RULE THIRTEENTH) whenever the name of an animal ſhall be aſſumed as the agent to a verb, of which the object does not belong to the claſs of animated beings.

SIR WILLIAM JONES has deſcribed what, if true, would be a very curious effect of the termination را; *namely*, its power of reſtricting, as a definite article, the ſubſtantive noun to which it is imputed: as گل چیدن "To gather a (or any) flower;" گل را چیدن "To gather the (given or particular) flower." I have already remarked (ſee page 145 of this volume) that there is not, in my judgment, any foundation for the opinion ſtated by Sir WILLIAM JONES.

BEFORE I conclude the ſubject of the preſent ſection of this chapter, I think it neceſſary to offer a very few obſervations, *firſt*, on the poſition, and *ſecondly*, on the occaſional omiſſion of the مفعول به. The uſual arrangement of a Perſian ſentence requires that the مفعول به ſhould take its ſtation between the agent and the verb to which it belongs; but if the verb ſhall be in the firſt or ſecond perſons, it may be often obſerved to follow the verb. Example: یکی از بزرگان ملاح را گفت بگیر این هر دو را "One of the gentlemen ſaid to the boatman, lay hold of theſe two." If the مفعول به ſhall be a perfect ſentence, it muſt follow the verb to which it belongs. Example: شنیدم که زید می آید "I have heard that ZYDE is coming." And the particle که, which is generally inſerted, is ſometimes omitted in ſuch caſes.

Example: گیرم پدر تو است فاضل "I admit (that) your father is learned," &c. The natural arrangement of a Persian sentence may be accurately superceded in verse, or in measured prose; or in order to answer any useful purpose; but though it would be easy to adduce many examples of this nature, they are of too little importance to merit insertion.

NOTWITHSTANDING the verbosity of Persian authors, there is no Language in the world, of which the genius delights more in the abreviations of speech than the Persian Language. And hence it may be stated as a general rule, that the omission of every word, which is not necessary to the perspicuity of a sentence, will be deemed elegant in Persian composition.

THE مفعول به may be elegantly omitted, whenever the omission can be easily supplied by the understanding of the reader.

EXAMPLES.

چو سائل از تو بزاری طلب کند چیزی   بده وگرنه ستمگر بزور بستاند

"WHEN a begger demands your charity with weeping and la-
"mentation, give (it to him,) otherwise the oppressor will seize
"(it) by force."

فرستاد تا لشکر از هر دیار   روانه شوند بر در شهریار

"HE sent (orders) to assemble armies around his person, from
"every part of the Empire."

جوان مردی که بخورد و بدهد به از عابدی که روزه دارد و بنهد

"A LIBERAL man who enjoys and distributes (his property)
"is better than a devotee who fasts and accumulates."

If it were of any importance, it would be eaſy to multiply without end, as well in poetry as in plain proſe, the examples of the omiſſion of the مفعول به.

SECTION SECOND.

مفعول مطلق

OR

UNIVERSAL OBJECT.

The مفعول مطلق or Universal Object, though of common occurrence in the Arabic Language, is very rarely uſed in Perſian compoſition. It is defined to be THE INFINITIVE GOVERNED BY ITS OWN VERB, OR BY ANOTHER VERB HAVING THE SAME SENSE; as when we ſay in Engliſh, "He dreamt a dream;" "He ſtruck a blow;" "He rode a ride;" "He died an ignominious death;" &c. And as this noun, which is peculiar to a few verbs in our Language, might be reaſonably, though not idiomatically, common to them all; ſo, it is therefore termed by the Arabian Grammarians, the مفعول مطلق; or *that object which is (or might be) common to all the verbs of any given Language without exception.* I ſay it might be common to all the verbs of any given Language, *firſt*, becauſe the ſenſe of every verb may be accurately modified by means of an adverb; as when we ſay in Engliſh, "He died ignominiouſly;" and *ſecondly*, becauſe every adverb ſo employed, may be accurately conſidered as an adjective applicable to the مفعول مطلق; as "He died an ignominious death," and other examples of the ſame nature.

The مفعول مطلق is employed, in the Arabic Language, *firſt*, to corroborate the ſenſe of its own verb; in which caſe it adds no new idea to the ſentence: as جلست جلوسا "I ſat a ſitting;" that is to ſay, "I ſat," or "I ſat down;" &c. *ſecondly*, to reſtrict

to unity the ſenſe of the verb; as جَلَسْتُ جَلْسَةً "I ſat down *once*," or *one ſitting;* and *finally*, to modify the action of the verb; as جَلَسْتُ جِلْسَةً "I ſat *in a certain poſture;*" &c. In the firſt ſenſe only, the مَفْعُولِ مُطْلَق is generally uſed in our Language; for if it be affirmed of an individual that "He dreamt a dream," it is obvious that the word *dream* adds nothing to the ſenſe of the preceding verb, ſince every man who dreams at all, muſt of neceſſity dream *a dream.*

In the Perſian Language, the مَفْعُولِ مُطْلَق is generally followed by the letter يَايِ مَجْهُول; which may be ſometimes a pleonaſm; in which caſe the مَفْعُولِ مُطْلَق will merely corroborate, without adding to the ſenſe of the preceding verb; or ſometimes it may have the ſenſe of يَايِ وَحْدَت or *Ya of Unity;* in which caſe it will reſtrict to *unity*, or modify, as above, the action of the verb. I have already ſtated that the examples of the مَفْعُولِ مُطْلَق are of rare occurrence in the Perſian Language; and in order to find them, I am under the neceſſity of having recourſe to the Poets. The two following reſt on the high authority of Nezaumee, a Poet of an admirable genius, too often obſcured by the vices of his taſte.

بیا ساقی از باده بردار بند　　بپیمای پیمودنی باده چند　　نظامی

* * * * *

بجنبید جنبیدنی باشکوه　　چو از زلزله کالبدهای کوه　　نظامی

I do not chuſe to tranſlate theſe verſes, of which the ſenſe will be obvious to every ſcholar. It may be neceſſary, however, to ſtate that the ſecond line of the firſt Example might (accurately as to the ſenſe) be put into the following more ſimple order: بپیمای باده پیمودنی چند "Meaſure out wine (in) ſeveral meaſurements;" or "Give us repeatedly to quaff the wine."

Of the occurrence of the مفعول مطلق followed by the اضافت or Genetive case, and destitute of the letter یای مجهول, the following Example may be cited on the authority of Saadee.

نگه کرد رنجیده بر من فقیه   نگه کردن عالم اندر سفیه

"The learned doctor looked on me frowning, as a learned "man looks at a fool."

The term مفعول مطلق may, without much impropriety, be applied to those adverbs or adjective nouns which are employed, in every Language, to modify the sense of a given verb. Examples: سخت دویدم "I ran swiftly;" طعام را سیر خوردم "I eat my fill;" از حرکت او بسیار رنجیدم "I was greatly vexed with his conduct;" &c. In poetry, these adverbs sometimes follow the verb. Example: بجوشید لشکر بانوشید سخت &c. &c. And it will be remembered, as already stated, that they are truly adjective nouns employed to modify the sense of the infinitive of every verb to which they are imputed.

SECTION THIRD.

منادی

OR

VOCATIVE.

Nouns in the vocative case are supposed, by the Persian Grammarians, to form one species of the مفعول or *object to a transitive verb*; because every noun so employed, might obviously follow a transitive verb in the objective case; since it constitutes, in fact, the person or thing addressed by the speaker: as "O James;" "I call thee James;" "O death;" "I call thee death;" &c. &c.

THE vocative may be formed, in the Persian Language, by adding to the nominative the letter *alif quiescent*; as خدایا O GOD! یارا O my friend! پادشاها O my Sovereign! دستگیرا O my protector! دریغا Alas! alas! حسرتا O the pity! &c. This letter, which is seldom added to proper names, is less commonly used in the language than the particle ای; which may be accurately prefixed to any given substantive or adjective noun without exception: as ای خداوند; ای پادشاه; ای دوستان; ای مرده; ای درد or ای دردا; ای دریغ or ای دریغا; &c.

EXAMPLE.

ای دریغا ای دریغا ای دریغ کان چنان ماهی نهان شد زیر میغ

"ALAS! Alas! that such a moon as this, should be hidden from our view by the intercepting clouds."

THE particles ایا and یا are also used to form the vocative case: as ایا شاه محمود کشور گشای "O thou Prince MAHMOOD, the conqueror of kingdoms!" یا الهی بده تو توفیقم "O GOD grant me grace!" &c. but these particles are, comparatively speaking, of rare occurrence in the Persian Language. To them we may add the word وا; as وا زید; وا عمر; وا حسرتا; وا دریغ; &c. and the Hindoostanee word اری; which is employed by SHEFAEE in the following verse: اری گیدی تو کجا و درک کجا شعر کجا "O thou kite, what pretensions hast thou to sense or poetry?" The word گیدی is a Relative noun, formed from its primitive گید *a kite*, or *a vulture*.

THE حرف ندا or *Vocative particle*, or the منادی itself, or

Vocative

Vocative case, are often omitted: as

ای تمامی خواب من برده بچشم نیم خواب "O! you have stolen away my rest, with those eyes melting as in slumber!" *

صبا بلطف بگو آن غزال رعنا را "O thou morning breeze! inform, I pray you, that graceful fawn;" &c.

The sentence which generally accompanies every noun in the vocative case, is termed جواب ندا; and in the common order of speech, it ought to follow the منادی, to which, however, it is sometimes prefixed; as at other times, the منادی is inserted between the various members of which it is composed. Examples: ای مجلسیان راه خرابات کدام است "Tell me, my friends, which is the road that leads to the tavern?"

رو زنار ببند ای بت پرست "Go thou idolater, and assume the Zoonnaur" (the badge of infidelity; being a string worn by the Brahmans as a mark of their cast;)

هزار سختیت ای دوست بر من آسان است "I can bear with ease, O my beloved, a thousand hardships inflicted by thee!" &c.

* I do not pretend to be able to translate the epithet چشم نیم خواب; though it represent, perhaps with more accuracy than any other epithet, that soft and subdued lustre of the female eye, which is so much admired by the Persian Poets. It is curious to observe the wild and wandering fancy of those fantastic children of genius, who have resorted to slumber; (چشم نیم خواب) intoxication; (چشم مست) and disease; (بیمار چشم) in order to describe the appearances which they admire in the human eye. The چشم مست denotes, I suppose, the possession by nature of that sparkling intelligence and animation of the eye, which is sometimes the effect of a mind exhilarated but not overpowered by wine. The بیمار چشم denotes, on the contrary, a sort of interesting languor in the eye, often supposed to be natural to the possessor, though it is found sometimes to be the effect of disease.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

SECTION FIRST.

حَال

OR

NOUN EMPLOYED TO DESCRIBE THE STATE OF THE AGENT OR OBJECT OF A VERB.

Of the functions performed in ſpeech by the words or materials of which it is compoſed, there are ſome that approach ſo nearly together in their own nature, as to render it difficult, in many caſes, to define the difference exiſting between them. The حَال, of which I am about to treat, will furniſh one example of this kind; for its office is in fact ſo nearly connected with that of a ſimple adverb or an adjective noun, that the diſtinction between them, however obvious in many examples, ſeems in others to be entirely loſt.

In the Arabic Language, which is ſo conſtructed as to force on the notice of the learner, many Grammatical niceties which have been generally overlooked in other tongues, the حَال is diſtinguiſhed from the صِفَت or نَعْت by means of a caſe peculiar to itſelf: and thus the word رَاكِب, which is the نَعْت or *attributive* in the following example, جَاءَنِي رَجُلٌ رَاكِبٌ "A riding man, or a rider came to me," will aſſume the objective caſe (جَاءَنِي رَاكِبًا رَجُلٌ "A man approached me on horſeback;") when uſed as the حَال, to deſcribe the ſtate of the agent or nominative to the verb.

In the more ſimple ſtructure of the Perſian Tongue, there is no ſuch thing as the variations of caſe; and the order of ſpeech, or to ſpeak more accurately, the diſtinction of ſenſe between the حَال and the نَعْت, is therefore the only criterion to which on this occaſion

occasion we can have recourse. The حال is defined by the Arabian Grammarians, to be a noun used to explain the state of the agent or the object of a verb; or of both together; as لقيت بكرا راكبين " I met Bukr, both being on horseback;" &c. &c. But the حال may be formed in the Persian Language, *first*, after a noun in the vocative case; as اي خداي دانا و بينا " O thou our God, who art wise and penetrating!" *secondly*, after the ظرف; as بجائي رسيديم تاريك و تنك " We arrived at a place dark and narrow;" and, *finally*, after the agent or the object, or any other noun without exception that may happen to be connected with a given verb; whether substantive, active, passive, or neuter: as مرا ياري است سنكين دل " I have a mistress with a heart of stone;" شادان وخندان يار را بخانه بردم " Chearful and happy I carried my friend home with me;" زيد سوار آمد; " Zyde came on horseback;" ديدندش كريزان و افتان وخيزان " They saw him escaping and limping along;" &c. &c.

I conceive therefore that the حال denotes in the Persian Language, the presence at a given period of time, (namely, at the time of the occurrence of a certain event signified by the verb with which it is connected) of a certain attribute in the ذو الحال; or that substantive noun to which the حال may happen to be applicable. And this restriction, in point of time, will furnish the true and only criterion by which to determine the difference between the حال and the نعت or simple adjective noun; which denotes the *general* existence of a certain attribute, in a given substantive noun to which it is imputed, without any restriction as to the accident of time. To explain by examples. When we speak of " a gazing crowd," the word "gazing" is a simple adjective; or (which is the same thing) it is a participle used in the sense of an adjective noun; because it denotes gene-

fally, without reſtriction as to the accident of time, the exiſtence in the crowd of a certain attribute, namely, "gazing," which is thought to be commonly applicable to all crowds. But if we affirm, on the other hand, that "The crowd advanced gazing;" or "gazing on the melancholy object before them," the word "gazing" will then be the حال; and the act of gazing, as applicable to the crowd, will be reſtricted in its duration to that period of time which is occupied in the performance of the action ſignified by the verb *To advance*. The ſame difference of ſenſe will be ſtill more conſpicuous in other examples; ſince it is certain that the moſt moroſe and ill tempered of men may be caught *laughing* or *mirthful* on a given occaſion; though it would be very abſurd to apply to ſuch a character, the epithets of "a laughing or a mirthful man."

It follows from the preceding obſervations that epithets of a tranſitory nature, ſuch as *riding* or *walking*, *merry* or *ſad*, *happy* or *miſerable*, *on horſeback* or *on foot*, &c. &c. will be moſt commonly employed in the formation of the حال; becauſe we have ſeldom occaſion to reſtrict thoſe of a more permanent ſpecies, ſuch as *wiſe*, *fooliſh*, *virtuous*, *vicious*, *learned*, *ignorant*, &c. to that period of time which is devoted to the performance of a ſingle action. For if a man be WISE now, there is a great probability that he will continue to be WISE during the reſt of his life; and if we ſubſtitute God inſtead of MAN, we know that he muſt continue to be WISE for ever. But though we know the fact of his eternal wiſdom, we may, neverthleſs, aſſert in him the exiſtence of that attribute with reference to the period of our own ſupplications; as ای خدای ما دانا و بینا "O thou our God who art wiſe and penetrating!" and this is the fact wich has induced the Perſian Grammarians, whether accurately or otherwiſe, to declare the words دانا و بینا to conſtitute in this example the حال, to which the word خدا is the ذو الحال; and not the صفت or adjective applicable to that noun.

As

As a ſimple adjective is excluſively applicable to its proper object or ſubſtantive noun, ſo an adverb is excluſively applicable to the ſenſe of the verb, or to any given attributive with which it may happen to be occaſionally connected. For if we ſpeak of *reading well*, or *dancing ill*, it is obvious that the adverbs *well* or *ill* illuſtrate nothing but the ſenſe of the verbs *To read* or *To dance;* and ſo, alſo, if we ſpeak of "a good man," or "a virtuous woman," the adjectives *good* or *virtuous* are excluſively applicable to the ſenſe of the following ſubſtantive nouns. But we muſt connect a noun with a verb, or ſomething equivalent to a verb, before it can aſſume the character of the ذُو الحَال; that is to ſay, before the حَال can be formed from it; for as the حَال denotes the exiſtence, during a certain period of time, of a given attribute in the ذُو الحَال; or, to ſpeak more accurately, as the حَال is often applicable to the ذُو الحَال, not generally, but only on a certain ſpecific occaſion ſtated in the context; ſo it follows that there muſt be virtually or verbally ſomething (generally a verb) in the context, from which we infer the occaſion of its application.

To explain by example. If it be affirmed that "An army approached the frontiers," three (or more) queſtions will naturally ariſe from this propoſition, of which the firſt relates to *the army alone*, as whether it was large or ſmall, and this is anſwered by the adjective noun: "A large army approached the frontiers." The ſecond relates to *the action alone*, as whether the approach was rapid or otherwiſe, and this is uſually anſwered by the adverb: as "The army approached rapidly;" for it muſt be obſerved that the word *rapidly* does not, in this example, convey the ſmalleſt information with regard to the ſtate of the approaching army, but merely with regard to the action itſelf. The third relates to the verb and the noun; that is to ſay, it relates to the *ſtate* of the army, not generally, but on a certain ſpecific occaſion (the occaſion of its approach to the frontiers) ſignified by the verb with which it is connected,

nected, and consequently must be answered by the حَال; as "The army approached on horseback;" or, to include all three in a single sentence, "A *large* army *rapidly* approached the frontiers, *mounted* on horseback;" &c.

Having endeavoured to explain the nature of the حَال, as contradistinguished from adverbs and adjective nouns, it remains to be remarked that every نَعْت, that is to say every attributive, whether it shall be naturally a substantive or an adjective, or a participle active or passive, or the member of a sentence, or a perfect proposition, may be found occasionally to form the حَال. For the حَال is merely an adjective noun used in the way which I have endeavoured to explain; and whatever is capable of assuming the attributive character in the structure of a sentence, must be *therefore* capable of forming the حَال. Now every attributive by its own nature, may be resolved into a substantive noun and a mark of connexion; as *gold*, *golden* or *of gold*; *lead*, *leaden* or *of lead*; *&c.* and the substantive itself, is often found to assume the attributive character without the aid of a mark of connexion; as when we speak of *gold wire*, *silk thread*, and other examples of the same nature. It is easy to perceive, therefore, that the حَال will be sometimes, by its own nature, an adjective or a participle, or the member of a sentence, or a perfect proposition; and sometimes, a substantive noun used as an adjective, either with or without the aid of a mark of connexion.

I now proceed to detail the rules (not very important,) that regard the application of the حَال to the purposes of speech.

RULE FIRST.

The حَال is not verbally distinguished from the صِفَت or نَعْت, otherwise than by the absence of the vowel كَسْرَهٔ تَوْصِيفِي which

which muſt be inſerted after the مَوْصُوف or مَنْعُوت (that is to ſay, after a ſubſtantive followed by an adjective noun,) but not after the ذُوالحَال followed by the حَال. Examples: زَيْدِ سُوار آمَد "The horſeman ZYDE came;" زَيْد سُوار آمَد "ZYDE came on horſeback;" &c. It ſhould be remarked, however, that the مَنْعُوت or مَوْصُوف is ſo intimately connected with the نَعْت or صِفَت, as not to admit, perhaps, of the intervention between them of any other word, not even of the termination را; whereas the ذُوالحَال is very often ſeparated from the حَال by means of the intervention of other words. Thus the word سُوَار muſt be the حَال and not the صِفَت in the following examples: زَيْد آمَد سُوَار; or سُوَار آمَد زَيْد; becauſe the verb آمَد would not otherwiſe intervene between the ſubſtantive and the adjective noun.

RULE SECOND.

THE natural order of ſpeech requires that the ذُوالحَال ſhall precede the حَال, whether with or without the intervention of other words. Examples: زَيْد گِرْيَان آمَد "ZYDE came weeping;" زَيْد نَامَهٔ بَكْر را خَنْدَان خوانْد "ZYDE read laughing, the letter of BUKR;" &c. But the order of ſpeech is of little importance in the Perſian Language, and the ذُوالحَال may, accordingly, be often obſerved to precede the حَال. Example: دَوَان آمَدَش گَلّه بَانى بَه پيش "A ſhepherd approached him running." Or it may often be obſerved to follow the verb; as بيامَد بيارى بَرَش تازيان خُروشان وجُوشان ونَعْره زَنان "He ruſhed forward to his aſſiſtance, raging and furious and uttering loud cries!" &c.

RULE THIRD.

THIS laxity of arrangement muſt be laid aſide, if it ſhall tend

 to

to create obſcurity in the ſtructure of a ſentence; for, in that caſe, the حال muſt follow directly the ذُوالحال. Example: زَیْد دَوَان عَمْر رَا بِگِرِفْت "ZYDE running ſeized AMR;" زَیْد عَمْر رَا خَنْدَان بِخَانه آوَرْد "ZYDE brought AMR home laughing;" &c. Or if the ذُوالحال ſhall not be expreſſed in the ſentence, the حال muſt then aſſume its place. Example: من گریان عمررا آوردم for گریان عمررا آوردم "Weeping I brought AMR;" &c. It muſt be obvious to the reader that the application of the حال to the *agent* or the *object* of a given verb, cannot be determined, in theſe examples, otherwiſe than by adverting to the order of ſpeech.

RULE FOURTH.

BUT if there ſhall be any doubt with regard to the application of the حال to the AGENT or the OBJECT of a given verb, the حال itſelf will often compriſe a perfect ſentence, in which a pronoun or ſomething of that kind will occur, in order to determine the ذُوالحال.

EXAMPLE FROM JAUMEE.

اَیْ عَمّ مَن کَرْدَم آنچه کَرْدَم وَعَقْلِ مَن بَا مَن نَه. تُو دَو تُو بِکُن آنچه

می کُنی وعقل تو با تُست

"O MY uncle, I acted as I have done, (being out of my ſenſes:) Do you act as you are doing, (being in poſſeſſion of yours.")

IN order to mark the جُمْلَهٔ حالِیَّه, which occurs twice in this example, I have placed it, improperly, between parentheſes.

RULE

RULE FIFTH.

When the حال shall comprise a perfect sentence, it must be connected with the ذوالحال; by means of a رابط expressed or understood; and the رابط employed on this occasion, will generally be the particle و *and*.

EXAMPLE.

مپندار و دلها بداغ تو ریش که روز پسین آیدت خیر پیش

" Do not believe, the hearts of men suffering under the calamities inflicted by you, that you will experience happiness on the last day."

The particle و which is expressed in the preceding example, may, however, be often omitted; as well as the pronoun required occasionally, though not invariably, in order to establish the relation existing between the حال and the ذوالحال.

EXAMPLE.

دعای منت کی شود سودمند اسیران مظلوم در چاه بند

" How can my prayers avail you! the victims to your tyranny being still in prison."

RULE SIXTH.

A pronoun may be often superceded by the substantive noun to which it refers; and this is termed in Grammar ذکر مظهر بجای مضمر *The use of a noun instead of a pronoun.* The pronoun, which would be referable if expressed, to the word ایوان, is superceded by the word خانه in the following example:

خواجه در بند نقش ایوان است   خانه از پای بست ویران است

" The master is busy in adorning his house; while the house itself is tumbling into ruin."

It is scarcely necessary to observe that when the حال is composed of a perfect sentence, it will generally follow the ذو الحال; to which, however, it is sometimes prefixed. Example: روی بر خاک عجز می گویم " My face bent down to the dust of humility and dependence, I say;" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

It sometimes happens that a second حال is formed from the first, when each of them happens to be a perfect sentence; and the second, in this case, is termed the حال متداخل; as opposed to the first, which is the حال مترادف. I believe this form of construction is more congenial to Arabic than it is to Persian idiom; in which, however, it sometimes occurs.

EXAMPLE.

زود باشد که خیره سر بینی   بدو پا اوفتاده اندر بند

دست بر دست میزند که دریغ   نشنیدم حدیث دانشمند

سعدی

" You will soon see the disciple of folly bound in chains, and wringing his hands with regret for having refused to listen to the counsels of the wise."

In this example, the second line forms the حال مترادف,

and

and the third line forms the حال متداخل to خیره سر, which is the ذو الحال. The ſentence indeed might be otherwiſe conſtrued, but the following arrangement of the words will ſhew that it admits, alſo, of this conſtruction.

زود باشد که خیره سر را بینی حالی که بهر دو پا گرفتار باشد و دست

بر دست زنان از حسرت و دریغ که سخن ناصح را بگوش نیاوردم

CONCLUSION.

I am not certain that the reader will accord, in opinion, with all the doctrines that I have advanced on the nature of the حال; or that he will think the ſubject ſufficiently important to juſtify the length into which it has led me. I ſuppreſs, therefore, many remarks of no great conſequence that might yet be offered on that ſubject; and ſhall conclude with an explanation of the principal which ſeems to determine the accuracy of the application of the term حال to a perfect ſentence, connected with another by means of the intervention of a copulative conjunction.

Of two propoſitions connected together by means of a conjunction, the one has not neceſſarily any ſort of dependence on the other; for if we affirm that "James arrived and John departed," theſe are two diſtinct propoſitions, and there is nothing in the ſentence by which it can be determined, that the departure of John has any thing to do with the arrival of James. But the حال has a neceſſary dependence on the ذو الحال, to which it forms an attributive, even when compoſed of a perfect ſentence; as the reader will eaſily perceive, by adverting to the example already adduced in the fifth rule: مپندار و دلها بداغ تو ریش الی آخره. In this example there is but *one* aſſertion, namely, that the perſon

 addreſſed

addreſſed muſt not expect future happineſs; the reaſon of this being aſſigned in the جملهٔ حالیه, "The hearts of men ſuffering under the calamities inflicted by thee." That the جملهٔ حالیه forms an attributive applicable to the ذو الحال, muſt be ſufficiently obvious; firſt, becauſe the ſenſe of the ſentence might be thus rendered: "You! under *whoſe* tyranny the hearts of men are ſuffering calamity, do not believe that you will enjoy happineſs at the laſt day;" and, ſecondly, becauſe every body knows that a ſentence compriſing a relative pronoun, forms an attributive to the antecedent noun.

Those adjectives, formed from the imperative of a Perſian verb by adding ان, as افتان و خیزان ؛ دوان ؛ گریان; &c. have obtained, in Grammar, the appellation of the حال; becauſe they generally denote attributes of a tranſitory nature, which are moſt commonly employed in that capacity. There is no doubt however, if the obſervations contained in the preſent ſection of this chapter are founded in truth, that any thing *may* be the حال which is capable of aſſuming the attributive character, though it may, by its own nature, be a noun ſubſtantive or adjective, a compound epithet, the member of a ſentence, or a perfect propoſition.

I now proceed to conſider the nature of the تمیز, another grammatical term to which there is nothing analogous in Engliſh Grammar.

SECTION SECOND.

تَمْيِيز

OR

NOUN OF DISCRIMINATION.

THE word تَمْيِيز ſignifies literally *Separation* or *Diſcrimination;* and, in its grammatical acceptation, is THE NAME OF A GIVEN SUBSTANTIVE NOUN EMPLOYED FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISPELLING AN OBSCURITY INHERENT IN THE SENSE OF ANOTHER WORD TO WHICH IT IS IMPUTED. If we ſpeak of "A good man," for example, the word GOOD is not the تَمْيِيز, becauſe it diſpels an obſcurity relating to the *attributes* of the man; but not, perſonally, to the idea ſignified by the word MAN, in which there is no obſcurity of any kind. But if we ſpeak of TEN MEN; TWENTY WOMEN; A POUND OF LEAD; A RING OF GOLD; AN OUNCE OF SILVER; A YARD OF CLOTH; A MEASURE OF CORN; &c. the ſecond ſubſtantive, in each example, will be generally conſidered, (whether accurately or not,) as the تَمْيِيز or NOUN OF DISCRIMINATION, employed for the purpoſe of diſpelling an obſcurity every where inherent in the ſenſe of the firſt *

BY the word "obſcurity," as it is now uſed, I do not mean to affirm that the firſt noun can be underſtood only in conjunction with the ſecond; for, on the contrary, the word TEN for example, is clearly the ſubſtantive name of a number, as the word RING or CIRCLE is the name of a certain figure familiar to the eye; and ſo far, both are perfectly intelligible without reference to any other word. But the ſenſe of the word RING is common to

* The firſt noun is known in Grammar by the term مُمَيَّزٌ عَنْهُ as oppoſed to the ſecond which is the تَمْيِيز

every

every subſtance, without exception, that may happen to poſſeſs a circular figure; and the word TEN is applicable to a certain number of units, in what ſhape ſoever thoſe units may exiſt. We cannot, a priori, tell the ſubſtance of which a ring is made; and if we ſpeak of TEN, we muſt be generally unintelligible, unleſs the numeral ſhall be followed by a ſubſtantive noun.

THIS therefore is the obſcurity, inherent in the ſenſe of the firſt noun, which is to be diſpelled by means of the ſecond; and the natural intimacy of their connexion together, will ſupercede, in certain caſes, the neceſſity or even the liberty of employing a verbal connective in order to eſtabliſh that connexion. To explain by an example. Neither the uſe of the اضافت, nor of any other particle, will be neceſſary or even admiſſible, in order to eſtabliſh the relation exiſting between the تمييز and the مميّز عدد if the latter ſhall be the ſubſtantive name of a number, as ده اسپ "Ten horſes;" or the name of a meaſure of length or quantity, as دو گز پارچه "Two yards of cloth;" چهار صد من مصری "Four hundred maunds of ſugar;" &c. But if the مميّز عدد ſhall be the name of ſomething, made or compoſed of the ſubſtance ſignified by the تمييز or *following ſubſtantive noun*, the connexion between them will then be eſtabliſhed, either by means of the اضافت, or the prepoſition از. Example: دو خاتم از زر دارم or, (which is the ſame thing) دو خاتم زر دارم "I have two gold rings;" &c.

The تمييز is ſometimes formed from a perfect ſentence; as when we affirm that "ZYDE is bad;" (زید بد است) in which caſe, it may be reaſonably aſked in what reſpect he is bad? whether in regard to the form of his perſon, or the diſpoſition of his mind; &c. &c. The anſwer to this queſtion will form the تمييز; employed for the purpoſe of diſpelling

pelling an obſcurity, inherent in the ſenſe of the word بد or *bád*, as applicable to Zyde: as زید بد است از روی شکل "Zyde is bad (or ugly) in his perſonal appearance." It ſhould be obſerved, however, that this mode of conſtruction ſeems to have been ſeldom or never uſed by the writers of Ancient Perſia; having crept into the language in modern times, in conſequence of the habit, common to many tranſlators, of ſacrificing the purity of their native tongue to the genius of the Language from which they tranſlate. The words زید بدشکل است accord much better with Perſian idiom, than زید بد است از روی شکل; a form of conſtruction which muſt be conſidered as bearing the obvious marks of a literal tranſlation from the Arabic Tongue.

Certain Arabic nouns in the objective caſe, are commonly ſuppoſed to form the تمیز: ſuch as حقیقةً ; مجازاً ; قصراً ; اصالةً ; نیابةً ; وکالةً ; دیانةً ; and many other examples of the ſame nature. Theſe nouns (uſually tranſlated by Engliſh adverbs) have been long naturaliſed in the Perſian Language; and the Perſians, unmindful that the uſe of the objective caſe renders them independent of any adjunct, have ſometimes (though rarely and certainly with little propriety,) added to that caſe the prepoſition به: as بعمداً for عمداً, in the following example from the Poet Hafiz: گو نام ما زیاد به عمداً چه می بری "Why do you purpoſely caſt my name from your memory;" &c.

It is in my power to offer ſome rules for the uſe and application of the تمیز to the purpoſes of ſpeech; but thoſe rules are very trifling; and the reader, if he knew them, would applaud that exerciſe of judgment which has led me to ſpare him the trouble of their peruſal.

SECTION THIRD.

تاکید

OR

CORROBORATION.

The word تاکید signifies *To ſtrengthen, corroborate, confirm, &c.* and, in its Grammatical acceptation, is the name of any one or more words, that may happen to be repeated for the purpoſe of corroborating a given ſenſe already once expreſſed in the ſentence. If we affirm for example that "Zyde came," (زید آمد), it is poſſible that the hearer may ſuſpect us of a lapſus linguæ: he may ſuppoſe that we have erroneouſly ſubſtituted the name of Zyde, for that of Amr; or the verb آمد, for the verb رفت. In order to convince him that we have not committed any ſuch blunder, it is uſual, in every Language, to repeat the propoſition in whole or in part; as زید آمد زید, or زید آمد زید آمد; in which caſe, the repetition conſtitutes the تاکید as already explained.

Or if it be affirmed that "The ſtudents of the College arrived," (شاگردان مدرسه رسیدند) it will yet be often matter of doubt, whether the term *ſtudents* ſhall be intended to embrace every individual among them without any exception; or whether the propoſition, though generally true, ſhall yet be liable to ſome exceptions. The introduction of the term همه, (شاگردان مدرسه همه رسیدند) or any other word of the ſame nature, will render the noun to which it is imputed, unqueſtionably applicable, without exception, to *all* the individuals of a given ſpecies; and this alſo (when the term همه follows the noun, but not otherwiſe,) is conſidered by Grammarians as a ſpecies of the تاکید.

THE

THE تاكيد therefore is of two kinds: *first*, the تاكيد لفظى or VERBAL CORROBORATION, which includes the repetition of words; as اين قوم اين قوم چشم بد دور از اين قوم "This tribe, this tribe, may no evil befal this tribe!" or the uſe of ſynonimes; as آمدم من *I came;* in which (accordingly to the general opinion of Grammarians) there are two pronominal nominatives to the verb; namely, the word; من, and the letter م, which is the conjunctive pronoun of آمدم. With regard to گفتش او را *He ſaid to him*, a mode of expreſſion which is of no uncommon occurrence among the writers of Ancient Perſia, it is moſt probable that there is no تاكيد; the letter ش being a mere pleonaſm, as well in this example, as in many others.

THE ſecond claſs is the تاكيد معنوى, or SENSIFLUOUS CORROBORATION; which is ſo termed becauſe the corroboration, in this caſe, flows from the ſenſe. If it be affirmed, for example, that "The nations of Europe are *all* of them more civilized than thoſe of any other region of the Globe," the word *all* will be ſaid to corroborate the ſenſe of the word *nations*, (or of any other word to which it may happen to be occaſionally ſubjoined,) though theſe words are not at all ſynonimous in the ideas which they are intended to expreſs. But if the word *all* were taken away, the ſenſe of the ſentence would be ſtill perfect; and the inſertion of that word ſerves only to corroborate or confirm the accuracy of the general propoſition, by ſhewing that it is open to no exceptions. On this principle the word *all* is here ſuppoſed to form a ſpecies of the تاكيد; but if that word ſhall take precedence of the word *nations*, "All the nations of Europe," it will no longer form a ſpecies of the تاكيد; becauſe the inſertion of the word *nations* is indiſpenſably neceſſary, in that caſe, in order to diſpel an obſcurity inherent in the ſenſe of the word *all*.

Under the second class of the تاکید are included many Arabic and Persian words nearly synonimous; such as خود *Verily or Self;* همه or همگی; هر یک or هر یکی *Every one;* جمیع or کل; تمامی or تمام; جملگی or جمله *All;* &c. as قوم فرنگ همه با فرهنگ "The people of Europe are *all* intelligent;" وتمام جنگ آور "and *all* brave;" وجمله دلاور "and *all* warlike;" وکل بی باک "and *all* active;" وجمیع چالاک "and *all* fearless;" وجملگی صاحب رزم "and *all* resolute;" وهمگی اولو العزم "and *all* military;" وتمامی خردمند و بحزم "and *all* prudent," &c. &c. It should be observed that the word خود never requires the plural number, even when it follows a plural substantive noun, as عاقلان خود گفته اند "The wise *themselves* have said;" &c.

The تاکید, in either class, is common to the Persian and to every other Language; and as I have no rules of importance to offer on the subject of its application to the purposes of speech, I shall here put an end to the present section.

SECTION FOURTH.

بدل

OR

EXCHANGE OF ONE WORD FOR ANOTHER.

The subject of a given proposition may be variously expressed; as for example by a proper name, "Zyde is virtuous;" or by a generic noun, Your Brother is virtuous;" when Zyde happens to the brother of the party addressed. But the use of both will be often necessary; "Your Brother Zyde is virtuous," in

order

order to define, with ſufficient accuracy, the perſon of whom we have occaſion to ſpeak: *firſt*, becauſe a man may have more brothers than ZYDE; and *ſecondly*, becauſe, having one brother, he may have many acquaintances of that name. In either caſe, the word ZYDE and the word BROTHER muſt be combined, in order to obviate, in the mind of the hearer, every poſſibility of miſapprehenſion.

OF two nouns ſo uſed, the firſt is termed the مُبْدَلٌ مِنْهُ or "The word for which ſomething elſe is exchanged;" and the ſecond the بَدَلْ or "Word exchanged for ſomething elſe." And the order of ſpeech determines entirely the character of each; ſince ZYDE which is the بَدَلْ when it follows the word BROTHER, will become the مُبْدَلٌ مِنْهُ when followed by that noun; or vice verſa.

I HAVE already ſtated that both nouns will be often neceſſary in order to define with preciſion, the individual of whom we have occaſion to ſpeak; and conſequently *both* muſt be held in remembrance by the hearer. The Arabian Grammarians appear to diſregard this fact, in the opinion which they have ſtated that "The predicate of a given propoſition is excluſively applicable to the ſecond or بَدَلْ, and never to the firſt or مُبْدَلٌ مِنْهُ. Thus VIRTUE, they ſay, is aſcribed to ZYDE, not to your BROTHER, when we affirm that "Your brother ZYDE is virtuous;" and to your BROTHER, not to ZYDE, if the tranſpoſition of the words (ZYDE your BROTHER) ſhall convert ZYDE into the مُبْدَلٌ مِنْهُ. The مُبْدَلٌ مِنْهُ is therefore conſidered by them as a member of the ſentence, not indeed wholly ſuperfluous, but introduced merely as a preliminary; in order to prepare and fix the attention of the hearer, on the بَدَلْ by which it may happen to be followed.

The بدل of the Arabians has been divided into four classes; *first*, the بدل الكل, in which both nouns are descriptive of the same individual; as جاءني زيد اخوك "Your brother Zyde came to me;" *secondly*, the بدل البعض, in which the بدل forms *a part only* of the مبدل منه; as ضربت زيدا راسه "I beat Zyde, his head;" or, according to English idiom, "I beat the head of Zyde;" *thirdly*, the بدل الاشتمال, in which some, no matter what relation, different from either of the preceding, must exist between the بدل and the مبدل منه; as سلب زيد ثوبه "Zyde his clothes were seized;" or "The clothes of Zyde were seized;" and finally the بدل الغلط, in which the بدل corrects the error of the مبدل منه uttered merely by a lapsus linguæ; as جاءني زيد جعفر "Zyde no Jaafur came to me."

In the Persian Language, the بدل follows the مبدل منه without the intervention of the vowel كسرهٔ توصيفي, or of any other connecting particle; as زيد برادر تو نيك است, or برادر تو زيد نيك است "Your brother Zyde is virtuous;" &c. The بدل in the second and third classes is invariably expressed, either by means of the اضافت, or of the termination را, which often supplies the place of the اضافت; as پاى بكر شكستم or بكر را پاى شكستم "I broke the legs of Bukr;" دست زيد گرفتم or زيد را دست گرفتم "I took the hand of Zyde." In translations from the Language of Arabia, Persian idiom is, however, not unfrequently violated by such expressions as the following: زيد دستش را گرفتم "I took the hand of Zyde;" &c. a form of construction which cannot, I believe, be supported by the authority of any classical writer. The بدل الغلط is necessarily common to

every

every tongue; and follows, in Persian, the words بل or بلکه, or any other word of the same nature; as زید آمد بل عمر or زید آمد نه عمر "Zyde no Amr approached;" &c. &c.

The عطف البیان of the Arabs is only a species of the بدل, from which it need not be distinguished in this work; as عبد الله ابن عباس "Abdoollah the son of Abbas;" اسد الله الغالب علی ابن ابی طالب "The conquering lion of God, Alee the son of Aboo Talib;" &c. In these examples, the words ابن عباس and علی ابن ابی طالب, are termed the عطف البیان inserted for the purpose of defining the nouns to which they are respectively subjoined. It would be a waste of time to offer any farther observations on the application of the بدل to the purposes of speech.

CHAPTER NINTH.

اضافت

OR

THE RELATION OF THE GENETIVE CASE.

It is well known that the number of cases applicable to the declension of nouns, differs essentially in various tongues. The Romans employed six cases; the Arabs have only three; and the Persians have but one case, namely the Genetive, in which the mark of annexation is given to the first or governing noun. The vowel کسره is the mark of annexation most commonly employed to indicate the relation of the genetive case; as پسر زید "The son of Zyde;" but, in certain cases to be detailed hereafter, that vowel point must be changed into همزه, as بندهٔ زید "The slave of Zyde;" or into یای مجهول, as دانای راز "The

"The knower of secrets," an epithet often applied to the DEITY. The sound of the three written characters, thus employed to represent the اِضَافَت, is that of کَسْرَهٔ مُلَیَّنَه or *the soft Hamza*, represented in English by an accented É; as in the proper name of ATÉ, the Goddess of Revenge.

IN reading a Persian manuscript, the utterance of the اِضَافَت is indespensibly necessary; and the omission of the sound which conveys it to the ear, would be an error of equal magnitude with the omission, in English, of the prepositions *of*, *to*, *from*, *than*, *in*, *with*, *by*, *for*, *at*, *among*, and many other words, and members of a sentence, by which the relation of the اِضَافَت is often translated into our tongue. If the اِضَافَت shall be represented by the letter ى, that letter must be inserted in Persian manuscripts, as in the example دَانَایِ رَاز already adduced. Or, if it shall happen to be represented by the letter هَمزه, that letter also will be often, though not by any means invariably, written above the line; as بَنْدَهٔ زید. "The slave of ZYDE." But the vowel کَسْرَه, which is by far the most common mark of the اِضَافَت, seldom appears in written composition; because, though it might be accurately and generally inserted, the usage of the Language has determined otherwise.

THE great importance of the اِضَافَت is founded, therefore, on a double basis; *first*, on the extent (almost incredible) of its application to Persian composition; and *secondly*, on the omission, in writing, of the vowel کَسْرَه, by which it ought to be distinguished in manuscript to the eye of the reader, as it must be in utterance to the ear of the hearer. The ordinary omission of the mark of the اِضَافَت is undoubtedly a great defect in Persian writing; insomuch, that I am not certain whether it has not been the cause of more obscurity, than would result, in the event of its insertion, from the omission of all the Persian prepositions. And

hence

hence we may infer the necessity of acquiring an intimate knowledge of the nature and use of this particle, of which the explanation in theory is simple and easy.

In the Arabic Language, there is a state in which nouns exist before they are put into any case; as when an Arab, in reckoning the number of persons before him, pronounces their names: زيد، عمر، بكر, &c. &c. curtailed of the terminations that indicate case. When the noun is put into the nominative, objective, or relative cases, the three vowel points (whether accompanied or not by the mark تنوين) will then be given to the last letter; as الرجلُ، الرجلَ، الرجلِ؛ زيدٌ، زيدًا، زيدٍ, and thus the *nominative*, as well as the *oblique* cases, is distinguished in that Language by a termination peculiar to itself, which is superadded to the form of the radical noun.

These terminations are undoubtedly marks of annexation; employed in order to determine the grammatical character which a noun may happen to assume in the structure of a sentence: and as a noun in the nominative case must be the subject or the predicate of a given proposition, and cannot generally be any thing else, so, it may be accurately inferred, in all probability, that the relation signified by the nominative case is truly specific in every Language. If it be affirmed, for example, that "Zyde beateth;" (زيدٌ يضرب) or that "Zyde is beaten;" (زيدٌ يُضرب) the Grammatical relation of Zyde, to the predicate of the proposition, is exactly the same in either case: (that is to say, the relation of زيد to يضرب in the one case, is of the same nature with that of زيد to يُضرب in the other case,) and so, also, if it be affirmed that "Zyde stood;" (زيدٌ قامَ) or that "Zyde is generous;" (زيدٌ كريمٌ) this Grammatical relation, allowing for the difference of the predicates in point of sense, will be still the same. And hence it may be inferred, as already stated,

that

that the nominative is employed, in every Language, to denote that *ſpecific*, and therefore *unchangeable* relation, that exiſts between the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition.

THE relation ſignified by the objective caſe is not, among the Arabs, equally ſpecific; becauſe that caſe is employed by them for other purpoſes, (خاتمٌ فضةً " A ring of ſilver," &c.) beſides the great purpoſe of marking the object of a tranſitive verb. It is unneceſſary here to enquire into the nature of the various relations expreſſed among the Arabs, by the objective caſe; and I ſhall therefore proceed to inveſtigate the nature of the اِضافت, or that relation which is expreſſed in the Perſian, as in every other Tongue, by the Genetive caſe.

THE prepoſition OF, which marks the Genetive in our Language, is often employed to connect a noun with a verb; as when we ſay of an author, that " he treats well *of* a given ſubject;" or any other example of the ſame nature. The Perſian اِضافت is, on the contrary, wholly incapable of eſtabliſhing any poſſible relation between a noun and a verb; and is never employed, but for the purpoſe of connecting together two nouns ſignificant of different objects; as خاتمِ سیم *A ring of Silver*, کیسهٔ زر *A purſe of Gold*, &c. &c. Among the number of nouns, in the preſent ſenſe of the term *noun*, we muſt, however, include thoſe Engliſh prepoſitions which are conſidered as nouns of the claſs termed ظروف by the Perſian Grammarians; becauſe they require, invariably, the ſign of the اِضافت; as بالای آسمان *Above* (of) *the heavens*; زیرِ زمین *Under* (of) *the earth*; پیشِ قاضی *Before* (of) *the judge*; پسِ خانه *Behind* (of) *the houſe*; میانِ لشکریان *Amidſt* (of) *the ſoldiers*; برِ من or نزدِ من or نزدیکِ من *Near* (of) *me*; همراهِ من *with* (or literally a fellow traveller of) *me*; and perhaps one or two more, which

do

do not, at present, occur to my recollection. The word بر, when it signifies ON, does not, any more than the other prepositions of the Persian Language, admit the اضافت; as بر اسپ سوار شدم "I mounted a horse;" با یار دوچار شدم "I met my friend;" &c. &c.

THE vowel کسره, when employed to mark the اضافت, is termed کسرهٔ اضافی or *The relative Kusra*; and is to be distinguished from the term کسرهٔ توصیفی or *The attributive Kusra*, which is the same mark, employed to establish the connexion between a given substantive and the following attributive of any kind; as مرد عاقل *A wise man*; زن باهوش *An intelligent woman*; &c. The nature of the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی will be the subject of discussion in the following Chapter, and need not therefore employ our attention for the present. Of two nouns connected together by the relation of the genetive case, the first or governing noun is termed the مضاف, as opposed to the second, which is the مضاف الیه. The nature of the relation existing between them is accurately defined by the term اضافت, which signifies literally RELATION IN GENERAL. And the term GENETIVE might be advantageously exchanged for the more appropriate designation of the GENERAL CASE; because this case does indeed denote, in every Language, the existence of *some relation or other* between two nouns significant of different objects, but never *defines* in any Language, the nature of the relation expressed by itself.

IT would be easy to establish the accuracy of this proposition by many examples of common occurrence in every tongue; but I shall borrow one example from the ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, of a nature so indisputable, as, in my opinion, to place the question beyond the utmost reach of controversial discussion.

"If an expreſſion be uſed, in which are connected together, "by the genetive caſe, two words ſignificant of objects be- "tween which *a twofold relation* may ſubſiſt, it will be "found impoſſible, from the expreſſion, to determine *which* "of theſe two relations is the true one; which muſt be "gathered from the context alone. Thus, for example, from the "phraſe *injuria regis*, no man can know whether the injury men- "tioned be an injury *ſuffered*, or an injury *inflicted* by the king; "but if the genetive caſe notified any particular relation, (that is to "ſay, if the genetive caſe notified any one ſpecific relation as op- "poſed to another,) it is not poſſible that any ſuch ambiguity "could exiſt; and hence it may be inferred that the genetive caſe "does indeed give notice, that two objects are *ſomehow or other* "connected together, but never *defines* the nature of the relation "that may exiſt between them." ENC. BR. ART. GRAMMAR.

So alſo in the Perſian Language, the words خدمت پیران will generally ſignify "Service offered or given *to* religious inſtructors" (by their devoted flock;) and خدمت مریدان will be ſignificant of "Service performed *by* diſciples" (to the perſon whom they have choſen as their religious guide.) In ſhort the agent and the object of the tranſitive verb خدمت, (namely, thoſe who *ſerve* and thoſe who *are ſerved*) are here indifferently connected with the infinitive mode of that verb by means of the relation of the genetive caſe; and it is obviouſly the knowledge, *and that alone*, which we entertain of the meaning of the terms پیر and مرید, by which we are enabled to determine, with tolerable certainty, the nature of theſe two oppoſite relations. Whether خدمت پیران ought to be rendered ſervices *given* or *received* by religious inſtructors, the genetive caſe will never determine; but we know that ſuch inſtructors are more commonly in the habit of *receiving* than of *yielding* the marks of ſubmiſſion, and on that principle we determine the queſtion. It would be eaſy

to adduce many other examples of the ſame nature; as فدويت اين خاكسار " The devotion *of* this humble dependent;" فدويت خديو مهر افسر " Devotion *to* the Sun enthroned King;" &c. It may be inferred therefore, with certain accuracy, that the relation ſignified by the genetive caſe is not leſs indefinite in the Perſian Language, than it has been found to be in every other tongue*.

But as the genetive caſe does not define the nature of the relation expreſſed by itſelf, ſo it muſt be obvious that this caſe will be *therefore* applicable to the eſtabliſhment of any one ſpecific relation as well as of another; that is to ſay, it is not poſſible to conceive a given ſpecific relation, exiſting between two nouns ſignificant of different objects, that may not, in theory at leaſt, be accurately expreſſed by the genetive caſe. This follows plainly from the nature of the term GENERAL RELATION, under which is included every *ſpecific* relation that can be imagined. And if we extend through various tongues our enquiries into the nature of the genetive caſe, I am perſuaded that theory and practice will be found to agree; for if we ſelect a given ſpecific relation exiſting between two nouns ſignificant of different objects, that cannot, in a given Language, be accurately expreſſed by the genetive caſe, it is more than probable that *the very ſame relation* will be accurately and commonly expreſſed by that caſe in ſome other tongue. This at leaſt I have found to be generally true, on comparing the various and oppoſite relations, reſpectively ſignified by the genetive caſe, in the Engliſh, Arabic and Perſian tongues.

* The name of every event of the tranſitive claſs, has naturally a *two-fold* relation: *firſt*, to the AGENT, and *ſecondly* to the OBJECT of the tranſitive verb which is derived from it. The word LOVE, for example, may be connected, by means of the relation of the genetive caſe, with the AGENT or the OBJECT of the verb TO LOVE: and if we ſpeak ſimply of the *love of an individual*, it is impoſſible to determine whether we mean "The love which *another* bears to *him*," or "The love which *he* bears to *another*." The concluſion of the ſentence will commonly determine the queſtion. "The love of JAMES *for* his miſtreſs," "The love of JAMES *by* his miſtreſs," and "JAMES's love *of* his miſtreſs," are equally accurate, though the word LOVE is here connected, by means of the relation of the genetive caſe, *firſt*, with JAMES who is the AGENT of the verb; *ſecondly*, with JAMES who is the OBJECT of the verb; and, *finally* with JAMES and HIS MISTRESS, of whom the one is the AGENT, and the other the OBJECT of the verb TO LOVE.

In Persian, for example, the nouns نشینندهٔ تخت "Sitting *on* a throne," are accurately connected together by means of the relation of the genetive case; whereas the use of that case, in the example before us, is commonly superceded in English by the preposition ON. It would be awkward at least, if not erroneous, to substitute OF for ON in this example; or, in other words, to speak of a king as a man "sitting *of* a throne;" though that form of construction is perfectly accurate according to the idiom of the Persian Tongue. And so, also, the Arabic combination حسن الوجه "Beautiful *in* the face," cannot be idiomatically translated into English, by means of the relation of the genetive case; although the two nouns حسن and وجه, are accurately and generally connected among the Arabs by that relation.

ADMITTING therefore the extensive powers of the Genetive case, which cannot in theory be reasonably denied, it does not follow that the *practical application of that case* will, in any one Language, be co-extensive with its theoretical powers. The genetive case does not define the nature of the relation expressed by itself, and must therefore be theoretically applicable, with equal accuracy, to every specific relation that can be imagined to exist between two nouns significant of different objects; but as these relations are exceedingly numerous, perhaps innumerable, it would be inconvenient, in any one Language, to express them all by the same symbol; and hence it happens that other symbols have been every where invented, such as the prepositions *to*, *from*, *in*, *at*, *by*, *for*, &c. &c. by which we are enabled, whenever the necessity occurs, to define, at least in a certain degree, the nature of the relation which we desire to express.

THE use of these and other prepositions, which are often employed, in every Language, to connect together two nouns significant of different objects, tends to restrict, within the bounds of moderation, the practical application of the genetive case; but the restrictions thus imposed are not re-

gulated

gulated by any common principle, and hence it happens that they will be found to vary according to the idiom of every tongue. I ſay, therefore, that there is perhaps no poſſible ſpecific relation between two nouns ſignificant of different objects, that may not be accurately expreſſed, in ſome Language or other, by having recourſe to the GENETIVE OR GENERAL CASE; but there are many ſpecific relations that cannot be ſo expreſſed in a given Language, becauſe the purpoſes of perſpicuity will require, in every Language, the exiſtence of certain *definitive* prepoſitions by which we may be enabled, whenever it is neceſſary, to define, at leaſt in a certain degree, the nature of the relation which we deſire to expreſs.

It is probable, however, that moſt of the prepoſitions of every Language may be conſidered as *indefinite* in a certain degree; ſince many are capable of expreſſing more than one individual ſpecific relation, and ſome (ſuch as the word *for*) are undoubtedly capable of expreſſing many. But of all the prepoſitions in our Language, the word OF is the moſt indefinite; and hence it happens that this word alone is practically employed to denote a greater number of ſpecific relations, than can be repreſented, perhaps, by the united powers of every Engliſh prepoſition beſides itſelf.

But however extenſive the application of the genetive caſe in our Language may appear to be, it is much leſs generally employed than the relation of the اِضَافَت in the Perſian Tongue. And as the ſymbols are commonly omitted, by which that relation ought to be diſtinguiſhed in manuſcript to the eye of the reader, as it muſt be in utterance to the ear of the hearer, it is ſcarcely poſſible to impreſs too ſtrongly on the learner's mind, the neceſſity of acquiring an intimate knowledge of the nature and application of thoſe ſymbols.

For this purpoſe he muſt depend chiefly on his own obſervation, and on the oral inſtruction to be acquired from his teacher; for if

it

it be true, as I have endeavoured to prove, that the genetive case is theoretically capable of expressing every possible specific relation that can be imagined to exist between two nouns significant of different objects, and that it is practically employed, in every Language, to express *an unlimited number of such relations*, it must be obvious that no classification that can be adopted, will be so perfect as to comprehend them all. On the contrary, the very nature and essence of the relation signified by the genetive case implies a repugnance to submit to the restraint of such classifications; for if it could be truly said of that case, that it denotes a certain number of specific relations, and that there are others which it cannot possibly denote, it would cease from that moment to be the GENERAL CASE.

I PROPOSE therefore, in the subsequent part of this chapter, not so much to specify the nature of *all* the relations which the genetive case is found to denote, as to confirm the accuracy of the preceding observations, by demonstrating the aptitude of the genetive case to denote a greater variety of specific relations than can be comprised in any Grammatical treatise whatever.

THERE are five Persian words, *namely*, برای ، چون ، بر ، در ، از ; one or other of which is supposed to be capable of expressing, in every example that can be adduced, the nature of the relation of the genetive case: as تخت عاج or تخت از عاج "A throne of ivory;" خوابندهٔ شب or خوابنده در شب "A sleeper in the night;" افتادهٔ خاک or افتاده بر خاک "Fallen on the earth;" طبل شکم or شکم چون طبل "The drum of the belly;" اسب زید or اسب برای زید "The horse of ZYDE;" &c.

THE first has been termed the اضافت بیانی because the مضاف الیه denotes, in all the examples of this class, the thing or substance of which the مضاف is made; as دیوار از خشت

"A

"A wall of bricks;" انگشتری زر "A ring of gold;" &c. The ſecond has been termed اضافت بمعنی فی, becauſe the Arabic word فی has the ſame ſignification with the Perſian در; as دفاین زمین "Men or things buried *in* the earth;" نماز مسجد "Prayers performed *in* a moſque;" &c. No grammatical term has been invented for the Izafut in the third claſs, (نشینندۀ تخت "Sitting *on* a throne,") which may indeed be referred to the ſecond: but the fourth has been termed اضافت تشبیهی or *The relation of ſimilitude*, becauſe, in every example of this claſs, the مضاف الیه is compared to the مضاف; as دایۀ ابر or ابر چون دایه *The nurſe of the clouds*, or *The clouds which reſemble a nurſe*; a beautiful metaphor, employed to depict the influence of the clouds in cheriſhing the infant herbs of the ſpring.

The term اضافت لامی has been adopted to expreſs the relation of the fifth claſs; becauſe the letter لام is an Arabic particle, ſynonimous with the Perſian برای For. The relation ſignified by this claſs ſeems to be that of appropriation; but the term appropriation is very general, and therefore embraces an unlimited number of ſpecific relations having nothing in common with each other. If we reverſe (where they can be reverſed) the examples of the firſt, ſecond, third, and fourth claſſes, they will inſtantly fall into the fifth claſs; which may be conſidered, to uſe a Perſian phraſe, as a mere کاسۀ کشکول "A begger's diſh;" in which are promiſcuouſly collected together the moſt heterogeneous materials that can be imagined. Examples; تخت عاج "A throne of ivory;" عاج تخت "The ivory of a throne;" نماز مسجد "Prayers performed in a temple;" مسجد نماز "A temple dedicated to the purpoſe of prayer;"

طبلِ شکم "The drum of the belly;" شکمِ طبل "The belly or interior part of a drum;" &c. &c. In having recourse to this FIFTH CLASS of the Izafut, which merits not in fact the name of a class, Grammarians have virtually acknowledged the futility of their endeavours to effect that which will never be well accomplished in my opinion; *namely*, the restriction, by grammatical arrangement, of those numerous, nay innumerable relations, that are continually expressed by the genetive case.

THE relation of APPROPRIATION includes that of the Infinitive or Hasilé Musder to the *agent* of the verb which is derived from it, whether transitive or neuter; as خفتنِ زید "The sleeping *of* ZYDE;" کشتنِ زید فلان را "The slaying *by* ZYDE of such a person." Of the infinitive to the *object* of a transitive verb; as راندنِ درویش از تو نمی زیبد "It does not become you to drive away the poor." Of the *agent* to the *object* of a given verb, as کشندهٔ زید "The slayer *of* ZYDE;" دانای راز "The knower *of* secrets. Of the *object* to the *agent* of a given verb; as کشتهٔ زید "Slain *by* ZYDE;" راندهٔ خدا "Rejected *of* GOD." Of the infinitive and all the participles to the *Zurf*, as well as to *most other nouns* with which the action of the verb is any how connected; as برخاستنِ سحر "Rising *in* the morning;" داخلِ کلکته "Arriving *in* Calcutta;" راندهٔ درگاهِ کبریا "Driven *from* the court or favor of GOD." And (among the Arabs not the Persians) of simple adjectives and participles of all kinds, governing by the relation of the genetive case, that noun to which an imputed attribute may happen to be applicable: as حسن الوجه "Beautiful *in* the face;" صادق القول "Truthful *in* words;" محمود العاقبت "Praised *in* his end;" &c. &c. &c.*

AMONG

* The اسم تفضیل in the comparative degree, is sometimes, though rarely, connected with the following substantive noun, by means of the relation of the genetive case. Example:

AMONG common substantive nouns, the relation of APPROPRIATION includes that *of property*; as اَسْپِ زَیْد "The horse *of* ZYDE:" *of application*; as زِیْن اَسْپ "The saddle *of* a horse:"* *of nomenclature*; as رُوز دُوشَنْبه "The day *called* Monday;" عِلْمِ طِب "The science *of* medicine;" *of creation*, or *authorship*: as خُدای عَالَم "The LORD *of* the world;" شِفَای بُوعَلی "The Shefa *written by* ABOO ALEE SYNA;" of *a part* to *the whole*: as بَرْگِ دِرَخْت "The leaves *of* a tree;" سَاعَتِ رُوز "An hour *of* the day;" of *a receptacle* to the thing which is contained in it: as کُوزَهٔ آب "A pitcher *of* water;" کِیسَهٔ زَر "A purse *of* gold;" of *propinquity* by the relations of blood and marriage: as پِدَرِ زَیْد "The father *of* ZYDE;" شُوهَرِ هِنْد "The husband *of* HIND;" and of the words هَر and هَمه to that noun by which they are followed, as it is believed, in the genetive case: as هَر کَس "Every man;" هَمه مَرْدُم "All men;" &c. &c. &c.

THE relation of APPROPRIATION is every where obvious in these examples, and in a multitude of others that might be adduced; but that relation cannot be accurately expressed on every occasion, by having recourse to the preposition بَرَای FOR. The examples عِلْم کِه بَرَای طِب اَسْت ، اَسْپ کِه بَرَای زَیْد اَسْت ، رُوز کِه بَرَای دُوشَنْبه اَسْت found very awkwardly in the ear of hearer, and scarcely deserve the name of Persian; and the relation of APPROPRIATION will therefore form, in my judg-

Example: کَهْتَر خُود "Meaner *than* one's self." In the superlative degree, it is *generally* connected by that relation. Example: بُزُرْگْتَرِینِ مَرْدُمَان "The greatest of men;" اَفْضَلُ النَّاس "The most excellent of men." &c.

* It is unnecessary to state to the reader, that a saddle does not belong to a horse, in the same sense, that a horse is said to belong to his master; and consequently, that the genetive case denotes *one* relation, when we speak of "The horse of ZYDE;" and *another*, when we speak of "The saddle of a horse."

ment,

ment, a better criterion by which to determine the examples of the Izafut in the fifth clafs, than can be obtained by having recourfe to the prepofition برای For. The relation of appropriation includes a multitude of fpecific relations, by far too numerous to be comprifed in any Grammatical treatife whatever.

The اضافت has been divided, among the Arabs, into two claffes; of which the firft is termed اضافت لفظی as oppofed to the fecond, which is the اضافت معنوی. The firft clafs comprifes every infinitive, or fimple adjective, or participle active or paffive, which is connected, by means of the relation of the genetive cafe, with what has been termed its own معمول; that is to fay, with a given fubftantive noun which would be the agent or object of the correfponding verb. To explain by examples. The verb قال "He fpoke," correfponds with its infinitive قول "Speaking:" حسن "He was beautiful," with the fimple adjective حسن or حسين "Beautiful;" the active verb قتل "He flew," with the participle active قاتل "A flayer;" and the paffive verb قتل "He was flain;" with the correfponding participle مقتول "Slain." And hence it follows that the words قول زید "The fpeaking of Zyde;" حسن الوجه "Beautiful in the face;" قاتل بکر "The flayer of Bukr;" مقتول بکر "The perfon flain by Bukr;" exhibit examples of the اضافت لفظی; becaufe the nouns which are here in the genetive cafe, would be the *agent* or *object* of the correfponding verbs. To this fact the native teachers mean to allude, in fpeaking of the اضافت مصدر بسوی فاعل ; اضافت مصدر بسوی مفعول; and other expreffions of the fame nature, that are very commonly employed by them.

But it is not merely with the agent or object of the correfponding verb, that a given infinitive, or a participle active or paffive, or an adjective noun, may be accurately connected by means

of

of the relation of the genetive case. For on the contrary, the طرف will be very commonly found to assume that relation; as خفتن شب "Sleeping *in* the night;" خیزندهٔ سحر or سحرخیز "Rising *in* the morning;" خانه نشین "Sitting *in* the house;" رسندهٔ جزو or جزورس "Arriving *at* the knowledge of particulars;" or "Examining accurately the minutiæ of affairs;" قاتل شب or مقتول شب "A person slaying, or slain *in* the night;" رسیده کلکته or رسندهٔ کلکته "A person arriving, or having arrived *at* Calcutta;" &c. &c. And indeed it would be matter of considerable hazard, to assert of any given substantive noun which is any how connected with an active, a passive, or a neuter verb, either with or without the intervention of any preposition, that such noun cannot be accurately connected with the infinitive, the simple adjective, or the participles belonging to that verb, by means of the relation of the genetive case. I believe, however, that the فاعل, the مفعول, and the ظرف, will be found, as already stated, to assume that relation much more generally than any other description of nouns with which the verb is anyhow connected.

If the مضاف shall not be an infinitive, or a simple adjective, or a participle active or passive, governing its own معمول in the genetive case, the relation will be that of the اضافت معنوی; as پدر زید "The father *of* Zyde;" &c. And though the Arabian Grammarians have noticed what is considered by them as an essential inherent distinction between the nature of the اضافت لفظی and the اضافت معنوی, I shall pass over in silence the arguments employed on that question; first, because I am clearly of opinion that those arguments are founded in error; and, secondly, because there is not, in my judgment, any essential distinction between the nature of the relation expressed by the Izafut in either case.

I shall now proceed to detail the rules that relate to the application of the symbols employed to mark the relation of the genetive case.

RULE FIRST.

Of two nouns connected together by means of the relation of the genetive case, the first or governing noun will generally receive the vowel کَسْرَه. Examples: کِتابِ زَیْد "The book *of* Zyde;" مَهْدِ زَمِین "The cradle *of* the earth;" &c. This general rule is liable to certain exceptions which are to be detailed in the following rules.

RULE SECOND.

If the letter الف ا or واو و Maaroof or Mujhool, shall happen to occur at the end of the مُضاف or governing noun, that noun will then receive the letter یا, having the sound of همزهٔ مُلَیَّنَه or the soft Humza. Examples: عَصا "A staff;" عَصاي مُوسی "The rod of Moses;" دَانَا "Wise;" دَانَاي رَاز "The knower of secrets;" دَانها "Seeds;" دَانهاي انگور "The seeds of the grape;" گیسو or گیسوي "A ringlet;" گیسوي دلدار "The ringlets of my beloved;" پَرتو "A ray;" پرتوِ آفتاب "A ray of the sun;" &c. In every other case, the letter واو receives, as usual, the vowel کَسْرَه. Examples: گاوِ زمین "The bull of the earth;" (supposed to perform the office of Atlas, by bearing on his back the weight of the Globe;) ماهِ نَوِ روزه بِبِین "Look at the new moon of the festival of Lent;" &c. &c.

RULE THIRD.

A quiescent یا following the letter الف, as پَاي "The foot;" or the vowel فَتْحَه, as مَي "Wine;" or the the letter واو

Maaroof

Maaroof or Mujhool, as روی "The face;" شوی "A husband;" will itself represent the IZAFUT; and must receive, in utterance, the sound of همزهٔ ملینه, or the soft Humza already mentioned. Examples: پای فکر "The feet of thought;" می انگور "The wine of the grape;" روی دلدار "The face of my beloved;" شوی هند "The husband of Hind;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

The letter یای معروف, occurring at the end of a word, will receive, as usual, the vowel کسره. Examples: روشنی صبح "The light of the morning;" دانائی زید "The knowledge or wisdom of ZYDE;" &c. But this letter may be doubled in poetry, if the measure of the verse shall happen to require it. Example from Jaumee: بی خودی من ز عشقت گر چه از حد در گذشت "Although my intoxication, from the influence of your love, has passed all bounds;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

If the letter های مختفی shall happen to occur at the end of the مضاف, it will then be surmounted by the mark همزهٔ ملینه, which is written above the line; as بندهٔ پادشاه "A slave, or servant of the king;" روندهٔ بارگاه "A person going to the palace;" &c. The letter های مظهر or "The sensible Aspirate," when it happens to occur at the end of the مضاف, will receive as usual the vowel کسره. Example: پادشاه جهان "The King of the world;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

The last letter of every noun which is followed by a conjunctive pronoun of the singular number, whether in the genetive

tive or in any other case, will generally receive the vowel Examples : کِتابَم "My book ;" اَسْبَت "Thy horse ;" چاکَرَش "His servant ;" پایَم "My foot ;" مَیَم "My wine ;" شُویَت "Thy husband ;" رُویَش "His face ;" بَنْدَگیَم "My devotion ;" جامهٔ نُوَم "My new garment ;" &c. &c. But if the مُضاف Shall end in الف as عَصا "A staff ;" or in واو Maaroof or Mujhool, as خو and رو, for خوی and روی ; the letter یای مفتوح must then be added : as عَصایَم "My staff ;" خُویَت "Thy temper ;" رُویَش "His face ;" &c. Or if the مُضاف shall end in های مختفی, it will receive in that case the letter الف ; as جامهٔ اَم "My garment ;" خامهٔ اَت "Thy pen ;" نامهٔ اَش "His letter ;" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

In poetry, when the measure of the verse shall happen to require it, nouns ending in the letter نون, or in الف, or in واو Maaroof or Mujhool, or in یا Maaroof, may be followed by a conjunctive pronoun of the singular number, without the intervention of any vowel point, or of any alphabetical letter whatever. Examples : احسانِ بی پایانْت "Thy boundless beneficence ;" مژگانْش His eyelids ;" مولانْم "My master ;" چشمِ بینات "Thy seeing eyes ;" غزلهاش "His odes ;" ابروم "My eye-brows ;" پسرِ نیک خوت "Thy well disposed son ;" خورسندیم "My joy ;" &c. &c. It is to be remarked, however, that the first personal pronoun cannot be added, without the intervention of a vowel point, to any noun ending in the letter نون ; because, in that case, it would be difficult or impossible to pronounce the words. Example : چشمِ می گونَم, never چشمِ می گونْم "My wine coloured eyes ;" &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

If many nouns, connected together by the means of conjunctions, shall be rendered مضاف to a single noun, the vowel کسره will be given to the last only of those nouns. Example: چاکر و بنده و ثنا خوان شما ایم "We are servants, and slaves, and eulogists of you." But if a succession of nouns in the genetive case shall happen to follow each other, the vowel کسره will then be given to every noun except the last.

EXAMPLE.

من خاک کف پای سگ کوی کسی ام

تو خاک کف پای سگ کوی تو باشد

RULE NINTH.

The words هر *Every*, همه *All*, جز *Besides*, and چون *Like*, seldom or never admit, in utterance or in writing, the mark of the Izafut; although they are commonly supposed to govern the following substantive nouns in the genetive case. Examples: هر کس "Every man;" همه کس "All men;" یاوری بجز خدا نیست "There is no protector but God;" مرد چون بکر "A man resembling Bukr;" &c. In poetry, however, the word همه is sometimes followed by the mark of the Izafut. Example: تا شد خبرم در همه شهر درافتاد "Until intelligence of my condition was spread over the city."

RULE TENTH.

In poetry, when the measure of the verse shall happen to require it, the mark of the Izafut may be omitted in utterance, if the letter هاي مختفى shall occur at the end of the governing noun. Example:

نهر

چون خدا خواهد که پرده کس درد میلش اندر طعنهٔ پاکان زند

"When God determines to bring disgrace on a man, he inspires him with an inclination to censure the virtuous." In this example, the measure of the verse requires پردهٔ کس, not پردهٔ کس; but the omission of the mark of the Izafut is more common in ancient, than in modern poetry.

RULE ELEVENTH.

In poetry the mark of the Izafut is very commonly omitted, when the مضاف الیه shall happen to be a conjunctive pronoun in the plural number. Examples: عمر تان for عمر تان "Your age;" دل شان for دل شان "Their hearts;" &c. The omission, in this case, of the mark of the Izafut, is more common in ancient than in modern poetry.

RULE TWELFTH.

The mark of the Izafut is optionally and generally omitted after the word سر, when compounded with certain other words; as سر گروه; سر خیل; سر زمین; سر چشمه; سر انگشت; سر پنجه; سر کار; &c. And after the word صاحب in certain cases; as صاحب هنر; صاحب درد; صاحب شکوه; صاحب دل; صاحب نظر; صاحب مال; &c. And after the word شب in one or two examples; as شب خون and شب برات. And in certain other compounded words, such as سیلاب; آسیاب; سر زمین; &c. &c.

RULE THIRTEENTH.

If one or more words shall happen to intervene between the مضاف and the مضاف الیه, (an accident of no very common occurrence) the vowel کسره will then be commonly omitted.

omitted. Examples: شمارا ست نوبت بر این خوان نشستن for شمارا نوبت نشستن است برین خوان "It is your turn to sit at this table;" &c.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

When two nouns are borrowed from the Arabs, one of which governs the other in the genetive case, the first will generally, perhaps invariably, receive the vowel ضمه ; and the second will follow the article ال. Examples: تزکیّ النفس ; ابتریّ الاصل ; اجتماع النقیضین ; خاتم النبیین ; &c. &c. The vowel point of the first noun depends among the Arabs on the case, whether nominative, relative, or objective, in which it may happen to occur.

RULE FIFTEENTH.

When the مضاف الیه shall precede the مضاف , an accident of very common occurrence in the Persian Language, the vowel کسره must be omitted. Examples: جهان شاه "The king of the world;" عالم پناه "The asylum of the world; &c. But both may be rendered مضاف to any other word; as جهان شاها ; عالم پناها ; &c. &c. The precedence of the اضافت is distinguished in grammar by the terms اضافت مقلوب or قلب اضافت , "The reversed Izafut;" and the examples of its occurrence are exceedingly numerous.

RULE SIXTEENTH.

The termination را is often found to supply the place of the Izafut; in which case, it must be added to the مضاف الیه. Examples: زیدرا سر for سر زید "The head of Zyde;" عمررا پسر for پسر عمر "The son of Amr;" این گنجینه را در می گشادم for در این گنجینه می گشادم "I was opening

opening the door of this treaſury ;" &c. And in this caſe, one or more words may occur between the مُضَاف and the مُضَافٌ اِلَیْهِ, which laſt will be found invariably to precede the مُضَاف. Example: عَدُوْرَا بِهْ اِنْصَافْ گَرْدَنْ بِبَنْد for گَرْدَنِ عَدُوْ بِهْ اِنْصَافْ بِبَنْد "Bind the necks of your enemies by the practiſe of equity;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

It has been hitherto taken for granted that the relation of the genetive caſe muſt be eſtabliſhed between two nouns ſignificant of different objects. The fact is generally true, but the uſe of the Izafut will be better underſtood by adverting to the effect produced on the مُضَاف or Governing noun. I hold it as a principle, to which there are no exceptions, that the firſt of two nouns connected together by means of the relation of the genetive caſe muſt be a general term, or a proper name conſidered with reference to the poſſibility of its application to a plurality of objects. The word John, for example, is a proper name common to many individuals; and therefore we ſpeak of John of Gaunt, in order to diſtinguiſh *that* individual from others who are known by the name of John. The word England is alſo a proper name, applicable only to a ſingle country; and being therefore incapable of farther limitation, it will be ſeldom or never followed by a ſubſtantive noun in the genetive caſe. To a man who had never heard of England, we might indeed ſpeak of European England, or "the England of Europe;" but in doing ſo, we muſt be influenced by a deſire to limit the *poſſible* application of England, which might be the name of more countries than one.

The effect of the اِضَافَت is therefore to limit the application of a general term; and the extent of ſuch limitation will depend entirely on the nature of the مُضَافٌ اِلَیْهِ. If the latter ſhall

ſhall happen to be a proper name, or a perſonal pronoun, the مضاف will be often reſtricted to a ſingle object, or to a very few individual objects; as برادر زید "The brother of Zyde;" روی تو "Thy face;" and other examples of the ſame nature. And if it ſhall happen to be a general term, the limitation will then be leſs extenſive; but ſtill it muſt exiſt in a certain degree, otherwiſe the Izafut will be of no uſe. If the words روی انسان "The face of man or woman-kind," are to be conſidered as accurate, it is only becauſe the word روی, in it's utmoſt latitude, is applicable to the face or phyſiognomy of other animals, as well as to that of the human ſpecies. For if the word روی were excluſively applied to the human face, it muſt be obvious that the term انسان would add nothing to the information conveyed by that word; and muſt be therefore conſidered as wholly ſuperfluous.

The words سیاهی رنگ "Blackneſs of color," might be accurately condemned on the ſame principle; becauſe there is no blackneſs but that of color. But if we oppoſe ornamental colors to thoſe which ariſe from dirt and filth, admitting that blackneſs may reſult from either, the words سیاهی رنگ will then be accurate; becauſe the term سیاهی will be reſtricted ſo as to denote that blackneſs which is the reſult of ornamental colors, oppoſed to the blackneſs that reſults from filth. The accuracy of the terms رنگ سیاهی "The color of blackneſs," cannot be queſtioned; becauſe the general ſenſe of the term رنگ is clearly reſtricted by that of the following ſubſtantive noun.

If a word ſhall govern itſelf in the genetive caſe, a circumſtance of no very uncommon occurrence in the Perſian Language, as نیک نیک or نیک نیکان "Good among the good," or "The beſt of the good;" بد بد or بد بدان "Bad among the bad," or

" The worst of the bad;" the same principle may yet be observed to operate; for GOODNESS in man is a relative term, and it is higher praise to be " GOOD among the GOOD," that is to say, " GOOD in comparison with virtuous men," than it is to be simply GOOD; that is to say, " GOOD with reference to the species in general." That the words GOOD, WISE, VIRTUOUS, &c. &c. are merely relative terms, must be obvious to those who consider that if all mankind were equally wise, or equally virtuous, the terms WISDOM and VIRTUE would be of no use. The following lines of the poet NEZAUMEE contain the words بدبد " The worst of the bad," which the reader may perhaps be desirous to see.

ز مهر کسان روی بر تافتم   کسی خویشتن خویشتن یافتم
بر عاشقان گر بد بد شوم   همان به که معشوق خود خود شوم

" I RELINQUISH entirely the practise of love. I have found that myself am the best friend to myself. If, among lovers, I shall therefore be deemed the worst of the bad, (I care not) for it is proper that I myself should be my own mistress."

CHAPTER TENTH.

صفت و موصوف

OR

SUBSTANTIVE NOUNS ACCOMPANIED BY ATTRIBUTIVES OF ANY KIND.

UNDER the term ATTRIBUTIVE, as it is now used, I mean to include every thing, without exception, that may accurately coalesce with a given substantive or other noun to which it is imputed. AN ATTRIBUTIVE, in this extended sense of the term, may

may be a subſtantive noun, as مَرْدَانِ مَرْد "Courageous men;" or a noun of number, as رُوزِي دُو بَرِين بَرآمَد "Two days paſſed after this;" or a ſimple adjective noun whether primitive or derivative; as مَردِ نِيك "A good man;" مَردِ دَانَا "A wiſe man;" or a participle of any kind, as آبِ رَوَان "Running water;" آفْتَابِ تَابَنْدَه "The ſhining ſun;" قَامَتِ كَشِيدَه "A lengthened ſtature;" سُخُنِ مَعْقُول "A juſt obſervation;" &c. or an epithet ſimple or compounded, as مَردِ بَاغبَان "A gardener;" شَاهِدِ دِل رُبَا "A heart raviſhing miſtreſs;" پَادْشَاهِ تَخْت نِشِين "A king ſitting on a throne;" مَمْلَكَتِ رُوزْ افزُون "An empire encreaſing daily;" دَرَخْتِ خُود رُو "A ſelf growing or unplanted tree;" زَاهِدِ شَب خِيز "A night watching devotee;" مَردِ كَار دِيدَه "A man verſed in affairs;" دِلَاوَرَانِ جَنْگ آزْمُودَه "Experienced warriors;" مَحْبُوبِ خُجَسْتَه شَمَائِل "A happy tempered miſtreſs;" يَارِ گُل رُو "A roſy faced damſel;" پَادْشَاهِ بِي دَادْگَر or پَادْشَاهِ بِي دَادْكِيش "A tyrannical prince;" مُلْكِ بَجَنْگ گِرِفْتَه "A country conquered in war;" تَشْنَه لَبِ دَرْ آبِ فُرَاتِ چَشْم آشْنَا "A thirſty perſon ſwimming in the water of the river of his eyes;" مُصِيبَت زَدَگَانِ خَاكِ كُدُورَت وَغُبَارِ حِرْمَان بَرْسَر اَفْشَان "The unfortunate who throw on their heads the duſt of grief and diſappointment;" &c. &c. The reader will eaſily perceive, that I include under the term COMPOUND EPITHET, thoſe members of a ſentence, ſuch as خَاكِ كُدُورَت وَغُبَارِ حِرْمَان بَرْسَر اَفْشَان, that may be accurately aſcribed to a given ſubſtantive noun or an epithet, (as مُصِيبَت زَدَگَان) by means of the intervention of the vowel كَسْرَهٔ تَوْصِيفِي or "The attributive Kuſra."

ALL attributives are divided into thoſe which are PROPER, (صِفَتِ اَصْلِي or صِفَتِ عَام) becauſe they are truly attributive by

by their own nature; and into those which are IMPROPER, (صفت خاص or صفت عارضی) because they are not naturally attributive, but only assume occasionally the attributive character in the structure of a sentence; as مرد شیر "A man bold as a lion;" یار گل رو "A rosy-faced mistress;" &c. For I have already observed on a former occasion, that the words گل رو are merely two substantive nouns, having no grammatical character at all, but such as they acquire when ascribed to a given substantive noun with which they may happen to coalesce in the structure of a sentence.

THE PROPER ATTRIBUTIVES of the Persian Language comprise, *first*, the اسم فاعل or PARTICIPLE ACTIVE; *secondly*, the اسم مفعول or PARTICIPLE PASSIVE ; *thirdly*, the اسم حالیه formed from the imperative by adding ان; as روان , گریان, &c. *fourthly*, the صفت or SIMPLE ADJECTIVE NOUN whether primitive or derivative; and *finally*, the اسم تفضیل or NOUN OF SUPERIORITY, employed to indicate the relation of the comparative and superlative degrees. IMPROPER ATTRIBUTIVES of every kind may be distinguished, for the sake of convenience, by the term نعت, which is properly applicable, without exception, to all attributives of either class. The noun to which a صفت or نعت, may happen to be imputed, is indifferently termed منعوت or موصوف. The اسم تفضیل will be the subject of discussion in the following chapter, and this chapter will comprise all the observations I am able to offer on the nature and application of other attributives.

THE reader has already learnt the existing rules applicable to the formation of simple adjectives and participles of every kind. Compound epithets are formed by ANALOGY, according to the pleasure of every writer; and the rules that relate to the manner of their formation are too numerous to be comprised in any grammatical

matical treatise whatever. There is no necessary limit to the number of words that may enter into the formation of a compound epithet; and perhaps it is generally true, that any intelligible sentence may be converted at pleasure into a compound epithet, ascribed to a given substantive noun or pronoun by means of the intervention of the vowel كَسْرَه; as مَن هَر وَقت بِيادِ آن مِهْرَبان مي باشم "I am continually thinking of you my friend;" مَنِ هَر وَقت بِيادِ آن مِهْرَبان "I *who* am continually thinking of you my friend;" &c.

Now as we cannot number those infinitely various combinations that may occur in the formation of a perfect sentence, so it is also impossible to number those combinations, infinitely various, that may occur in the formation of a compound epithet. And as we do not seek to support, by the authority of prescription, the legitimacy of a perfect sentence unexceptionably accurate in the mode of its formation, so we have no occasion to support, by the authority of prescription, the legitimacy of a compound epithet unexceptionably accurate in the mode of its formation. To explain by examples. The following sentence is supported by the authority of SAADEE: پادشاهی را شنیدم که بکشتن اسیری اشارت فرمود "I have heard of a king who gave orders to put a certain prisoner to death." But the authority of SAADEE is here superfluous, because the accuracy of the sentence would be still unquestionable, though it were now uttered for the first time. And so also in the words تشنهٔ لبِ در آبِ فراتِ چشم آشنا "A thirsty person swimming in the water of the river of his eyes;" the epithet در آبِ فراتِ چشم آشنا might be supported by the authority of an eminent author from whose writings it has been extracted by me. But such authority is wholly unnecessary to establish the accuracy of that epithet, sufficiently supported by the analogous formation of other epithets, and by the privilege vested in every writer, by the compound-loving genius of the Persian Language, to invent and employ for the first time, as many new combinations of this nature, as the fertility of his fancy may enable him to discover.

Compound epithets have been ufually confidered as merely ornamental, and therefore better adapted to the language of poetry than of plain profe. If the fact were true, it would be dangerous to affume the privilege of inventing compound epithets; *firft*, becaufe it is never neceffary to aim at the higher decorations of ftyle; and *fecondly*, becaufe every unfuccefsful endeavour of that nature is juftly punifhed by the reader's contempt. But though I do not mean to deny that Perfian poetry is pre-eminently indebted, for the fplendor of its diction, to the happy felection (and often to the invention) of compound epithets bearing the ftamp of poetical fancy and tafte, it does not therefore follow that fuch epithets are *peculiar* to poetry, or to the elevated language of rhetorical profe. On the contrary they are of conftant occurrence in every fpecies of Perfian compofition; and are fo natural to the genius of the Language, that it would be very difficult, perhaps impoffible, to write a page of intelligible Perfian without having frequent recourfe to their aid. They are accordingly found to exprefs, not merely the fanciful imagery of poetic diction, but the common conceptions of ordinary life; as مردِ تجارت پیشه, "A merchant;" ملکِ به جنگ گرفته "A country conquered in war;" &c. And they occur in profe (more efpecially in the profe of modern times) with a profufion generally unknown to poetry, which impairs or annihilates all pretenfions to purity or even perfpicuity of ftyle.

I do not therefore recommend the invention of compound epithets, already by far too numerous in the Perfian Language, except in cafes of urgent neceffity; but as it will frequently happen that a writer, without the aid of thefe, will be wholly unable to exprefs his thoughts; fo it is alfo true that he may, nay, that he muft, in that cafe, have recourfe to the *invention* of compound epithets; not with a view to the ornaments of ftyle, but merely by the effect of a neceffary compliance with the idiom and genius of the Perfian Language. Such epithets, though unfupported

ſupported individually by the authority of preſcription, will yet be unexceptionably accurate if the inventor can ſhew, by analogy, the exiſtence of other ſimilar combinations; and it would be nearly as abſurd in the caſe of a compound epithet as of a perfect ſentence, to limit, by the authority of preſcription, the privilege veſted in every Peſian writer of forming new combinations for himſelf.

The following are many of the rules applicable to the formation of compound epithets; and I have already ſtated the impoſſibility of deviſing any claſſification, ſo perfect as to comprehend them all.

RULE FIRST.

An epithet may be formed at pleaſure, of any *particle* prefixed to a ſubſtantive or an adjective noun. Examples: مسافر بی نوا "An unprovided traveller;" مرد ناچار "A helpless man;" مرد با مال "A wealthy man;" وزیر بی تدبیر "An improvident miniſter;" زن لا عاقل "A fooliſh woman;" مال در دست "Money in hand;" مرد بر بام "A man on the roof;" دارای بی مدارا "The relentless Darius;" فریدون با آن شکوه "Fŭredoon with all his dignity;" &c. &c.

RULE SECOND.

An adjective accompanied by a ſubſtantive noun may be formed into a compound epithet, applicable (like the word Grey Beard in our Language,) to any object in which the imputed attribute may happen to exiſt. Examples: شاعر خوش کلام "An eloquent poet;" عاشق تشنه لب "A thirſty lover;" معشوق موزون ادا "A miſtreſs of pleaſing or graceful manners or appearance;" مال گران قیمت "Merchandize of high price;" قلم زبان شکسته "A broken pointed pen;" &c. &c. In all the examples of this claſs,

clafs, the arrangement of the epithet may be optionally reverfed, as مَعْشُوقِ سُخَنْ شِیرِینْ or مَعْشُوقِ شِیرِینْ سُخَنْ &c. &c. and it is a matter of indifference whether the attributive part of the epithet fhall be a fimple adjective, or a participle active or paffive, Arabic or Perfian.

RULE THIRD.

An epithet may be compofed of a fubftantive or other noun prefixed (but never fubjoined) to the form of the imperative in the fecond perfon fingular; which will then moft commonly affume the fenfe of the active, but not unfrequently of the paffive participle. Examples پادشاه کشورگشای "A conquering prince;" شربت گلاب آمیز "A draft mixed with rofewater;" &c. &c. The firft component part of the epithet may, in this clafs, be the NOMINATIVE OR AGENT to the correfponding verb; as (جایی که مشک می خیزد) جای مشک خیز "A place abounding in mufk;" or, *fecondly*, the ACCUSATIVE OR OBJECT; as خامهٔ گوهر ریز "A pearl fprinkling pen;" or, *thirdly*, the ظرف or NOUN OF TIME OR PLACE; as پاسبان شب گرد "A watchman going his rounds in the night;" گوهر خانه خیز "A gem fpringing up or born in the family;" or, *fourthly*, an adjective ufed ADVERBIALLY; as اسب تیز رو "A fwift going horfe;" or, *finally*, a fubftantive noun, any how connected with the correfponding verb, whether with or without the intervention of any prepofition; as توپ اسب رو "Horfe artillery," or "Artillery moving by the means of horfes;" &c. &c. &c. The fecond component part of the epithet, poffeffing the form of the imperative in the fecond perfon fingular, muft have the fenfe of the active or paffive participle; as شاعر گوهر بار (بارندهٔ گوهر) "A poet raining pearls;" نکات محبت آمیز (آمیختهٔ محبت) "Obfervations mixed with friendfhip;" &c.

It

If the form of the imperative ſhall happen to have the ſenſe of the Hasile Musder, as گوش مال for مالش گوش "Rubbing the ears," or "Puniſhment;" it will form no epithet, but merely a compounded ſubſtantive noun, employed to denote the name of an event.

RULE FOURTH.

An epithet may be compoſed of a ſubſtantive noun prefixed (but never ſubjoined) to the form of the verb in the third perſon ſingular of the preterite tenſe. In this caſe, the ſecond component part of the epithet will have the ſenſe of the paſt or paſſive participle. Examples: ملک خدا داد "A country given by God;" چشم خواب آلود "Eyes overpowered with ſleep;" &c. &c.

RULE FIFTH.

An epithet may be formed of an adjective, connected with its proper ſubſtantive noun by means of the relation of the genetive caſe. Examples: غزل عدیم المثل "An incomparable ode;" مرد صادق القول "A man truthful in words;" اولیای محمود العاقبت "The ſaints praiſed in their ends;" فقیر واجب التعزیر "A devotee worthy of reſpect;" &c. All the epithets of this claſs are borrowed from the Arabs; and there is not, I believe, any inſtance of a Perſian adjective connected with its proper ſubſtantive noun by means of the relation of the genetive caſe.

RULE SIXTH.

An epithet may be formed of two ſubſtantive nouns, one or both of which may be Arabic or Perſian. Any two ſubſtantive nouns that may be accurately connected together by means of the relation of the genetive caſe, will form an epithet of this

class, whenever the مُضَافٌ اِلَیهِ shall precede the مُضَاف; as دَرْیَا نَوَال "The bounty of the river;" نَوَالِ دَرْیَا "Bountiful as the river;" &c. Examples: ضَمِیرِ مَحَبَّت تَخْمِیر "A mind mixed or levened with friendship;" پَادْشَاه قَدَرْ قُدْرَت "A king powerful as fate;" جَنَابِ فَضِیلَت اِنْتِسَاب "A threshold related to excellence;" خَامَهٔ مَحَبَّت شَمَامَه "A pen perfumed with friendship;" پَادْشَاهِ مَعْدَلَت کِیش "A just prince;" آسْتَانِ وِلَایَت آشْیَان "A holy threshold;" خَاطِرِ تَوَدُّد مَظْهَر "A mind the source of friendship;" جَنَابِ مَعَالِی مَآب "A threshold the asylum of noble actions;" پَادْشَاهِ جَمْ جَاه "A king in rank equal to Jum;" دَسْتِ دَرْیَا نَوَال "A hand bountiful as the river;" یَارِ گُلْ عِذَار "A rosy faced mistress;" یَارِ سَمَنْ بَر "A mistress having a breast fragrant as jessamine;" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

An epithet may be formed of two Arabic nouns, the first being an infinitive, or a Hasile Musder, connected with an adjective or passive participle, by means of the relation of the genetive case. Examples: زَبَانِ فَیْضِ تَرْجُمَان "A tongue the interpreter of bounty;" قَلَمِ مَرْحَمَت تَوْاَم "A pen twin-born with mercy or kindness;" مَضْمُونِ خُلَّت مَشْحُون "Observations replete with friendship;" &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

An epithet may be formed, like a perfect sentence, in any possible way that is not repugnant to the rules of Grammar. The endless variety of combination exhibited in the formation of such epithets, must continue for ever to elude the utmost limits of Grammatical research. Examples; مُرْدِ خَانَه بَرْدُوش

"A

" A traveller;" or " A man who carries his houſe on his ſhoulders;"
حکیم سخن بر زبان آفرین " The ALLWISE BEING who beſtowed on the tongue the faculty of ſpeech;" مه لایق بتاج پادشاهی
" A moon, or beautiful woman deſerving the crown of royalty;"
عاشق خار عنا در پا رفتهٔ راه دشوار گذار مدعا گسلی " A lover who has received in his foot the thorn of affliction, caught in travelling over the labourful road of his purſuit;"
دل خسته فرق از سجدهٔ مالامال ارادت بر زمین سر افکندگی سجده ریز ساخته
" A wretch who has bowed his head to the ground of humility with proſtrations full of affection for thee;"
عاشق فرق تا قدم پیشانی گردیده بادای سجدهٔ نیاز باشی پرداخته
" A lover LOVER who, having converted his whole body into one univerſal forehead, is employed in performing the proſtrations of dependence on thee;"
والا نظران چشم از حاسدان وام گرفته در سراپای خویش نگر
" The noble minded who, borrowing the eyes of envious men, inſpect with vigilance their own imperfections;"

بشگفته رویان تندی خو از ستیزه کاران بعاریت خواسته
با عالمی بطریق صلح و با خود براه جدل گام زن و پی سپر

" The exalted characters who, having borrowed auſterity of temper from the vicious, walk with others in the road of lenity, (or judge of others with lenity,) and purſue themſelves the paths of ſeverity;" that is to ſay, " guard unremittingly their own conduct;" &c. &c. &c.

* * * * *

UNDER one or other of the preceding rules, it is probable that moſt compound epithets of the Perſian Language may be accurately and reaſonably compriſed; and though ſome of them, as the SIXTH RULE, might be ſubdivided into many claſſes, I am of opinion that no advantage would reſult from the multiplication

of

of ſuch diviſions. The principle of the rule* is broad and comprehenſive. It ſtates that two ſubſtantive nouns, connected together by means of the relation of the genetive caſe, may be eaſily converted into a compound epithet, ſimply by inverting the order of arrangement; as خمیرِ محبّت "The mixture of friendſhip;" ضمیرِ خمیرِ محبّت "A mind of the mixture or leven of friendſhip;" ضمیرِ محبّت خمیر "A mind mixed or levened with friendſhip;" &c. And whether one or both of theſe nouns ſhall be Arabic or Perſian, or to what claſs of Arabic or Perſian nouns both or either may happen to belong, theſe are queſtions with which I have nothing to do; *firſt*, becauſe is it ſufficient for me that both are ſubſtantive nouns; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe it will generally ſuffice for the accuracy of the epithet, that they ſhall form together an intelligible combination.

APPLICATION OF SYMBOLS.

THE ſymbols commonly employed to mark the relation of the genetive caſe, ſerve alſo to eſtabliſh the relation of a given ſubſtantive noun to the following attributive which is imputed to it: as مردِ شیر or مردِ چون شیر "A man bold as a lion;" بندهٔ نیک "A good ſervant;" عصای سخت "A hard ſtaff;" خوی زشت "A bad temper;" &c.

THE vowel کسره is diſtinguiſhed, in this caſe, by the term کسرهٔ توصیفی or "The attributive Kuſra;" as oppoſed to کسرهٔ اضافی or "The relative Kuſra;" employed to mark the relation of the genetive caſe. It has been obſerved, however, by certain grammarians, that the letter یای مجهول was anciently employed to diſtinguiſh the attributive relation from the relation expreſſed by the genetive caſe; as غلامی عاقل "An intelligent ſlave;" oppoſed to غلامِ عاقل "The ſlave of a wiſe

like

or intelligent man." But the words غلام عاقل unquestionably admit of either sense; and the introduction of the letter یای مجهول is comparatively speaking of rare occurrence, even among the writers of ancient Persia*. It is true, indeed, that the words غلامی عاقل will signify invariably "An intelligent slave," and cannot possibly be otherwise translated; but if the letter یای مجهول were introduced for the purpose of dispelling the obscurity to which I have adverted, it would be quite impossible to assign any good reason for the frequency of its omission where it ought to be inserted. The letter یای مجهول, when so used, seems to me to have the force of an indefinite article; and like the word CERTAIN in our Language' ("A person of my acquaintance," "A CERTAIN person of my acquaintance,") it may be omitted or inserted at pleasure.

ALTHOUGH the symbols employed to mark the attributive relation are generally the same with those employed to denote the relation of the genetive case, I think it necessary to detail the rules by which their application is guided and restricted in the Persian Language.

RULE FIRST.

THE vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی is commonly employed to mark the relation existing between a given substantive and the following attributive which is imputed to it. Examples: مردِ شیر or مردِ چون شیر "A courageous man;" پادشاهِ بیداد "An unjust Prince;" ضمیرِ محبت تخمیر "A mind levened with friendship;" &c.

* The letter یای مجهول is often inserted, at this day, after nouns in the plural or singular number, followed by the relative pronoun که; as کسانیکه "The persons who;" &c. and in this sense, it seems still to denote the attributive relation; since every sentence, comprising a relative pronoun, may be considered as an attributive applicable to the antecedent noun.

RULE SECOND.

If the letter الف quiescent, or واو Maaroof or Mujhool, shall happen to occur at the end of the مَوْصُوْف, the vowel کَسْرَه must be changed into یا, having the sound of ہَمْزَۂ مُلَیَّنَہ or *the soft Humza*. Examples: صَحْرَاۓ فَرَاخ "An extensive plain;" عَصَاۓ سَخْت "A hard staff;" اَبْرُوۓ مُقَوَّس "Arched eyebrows;" مُوۓ پَرِیْشَان "Dishevelled hair;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

An original یا occurring at the end of the مَوْصُوْف, after the letter *Alif*, or the vowel *Futha*, or the letter *Wao* Maaroof or Mujhool, must be changed, in utterance, into ہَمْزَۂ مُلَیَّنَہ; and will receive as usual the vowel *Kusra*. Examples: جَاۓ پَاک "A pure place;" مَیِ نَاب "Pure Wine;" رُوۓ دُرَخْشَان "A shining countenance;" گُوۓ غَلْطَان "A moving ball;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

The letter واو, following the vowel *Futha* at the end of the مَوْصُوْف, must receive as usual the vowel *Kusra*; and will not be changed in utterance into ہَمْزَۂ مُلَیَّنَہ. Example: دَانَہَاۓ نَوِ تَازَه "New and fresh seeds;" &c. The same rule is applicable to the letter وَاوِ مَعْرُوْف when it happens to occur as a double letter at the end of the مَوْصُوْف. Example: عُلُوِّ بِیْ فَائِدَه "Useless elevation;" &c. And to a single یَاۓ مَعْرُوْف in the same situation. Example: صُوْفِیِ صَافِی "A pure Soofee;" &c. But the letter یَاۓ مَعْرُوْف may be rendered مُشَدَّد in poetry, when the measure of the verse may happen to require it; as صُوْفِیِّ صَافِی "A pure Soofee;" مَثْنَوِیِّ مَوْلَوِیِّ مَعْنَوِی "The (celebrated) Musnovee of the spiritual Molovee."

RULE FIFTH.

The letter هاي مخفف, occurring at the end of the موصوف, must receive the mark همزهٔ ملينه or *the soft Humza.* Examples: بندهٔ دانا "An intelligent slave;" نامهٔ مشهور "A celebrated letter;" &c. The omission of the sound of همزهٔ ملينه is admissible in poetry, when the measure of the verse may happen to require it.

RULE SIXTH.

When two nouns, connected together by means of the relation of the genetive case, shall happen to be followed by a given attributive, it will be often impossible, otherwise than by the context, to determine whether the attributive shall be applicable to the first or second of these nouns. Example: پسران وزير ناقص عقل "The sons of the foolish minister;" or "The foolish sons of the minister," in which last sense the phrase has been employed by Saadee. But it is always desirable to avoid obscurity; and on that principle the attributive ought in my opinion to follow, without the intervention of any other word, the substantive noun to which it is imputed. Examples:- پسران ناقص العقل وزير "The foolish sons of the minister;" پسران وزير ناقص عقل "The sons of the foolish minister." Often indeed, nothing can be more important than the arrangement of the words composing a sentence. "Sir, said a person, I will tell you honestly how much money I got." "Sir, replied his adversary, will you tell us how much you got honestly?"

RULE SEVENTH.

If the موصوف shall be followed by two or more attributives unconnected by the intervention of copulative conjunctions,

every

every attributive, the last only excepted, will generally receive the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی or "The relative Kusra." Example: یار گل عذار شیرین سخن سمن بدن زیبا روی سیه موی &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

But if we intend to enumerate, by successive attributives, the good or bad qualities for which the موصوف may happen to be remarkable, the vowel کسره will then be generally given to the موصوف, and omitted universally after every attributive. Example: یار مه جبین مهر آگین غم گسار وفادار "A faithful mistress, brilliant as the moon, overflowing in love, the consoler of grief; &c." In this case the letter یای مجهول may be given to the موصوف, and to every attributive by which it is followed. Example: یاری مه جبینی مهر آگینی غم گساری وفاداری &c. Or it may be omitted, together with the vowel کسره, for the purpose of giving variety of sound to the measured prose in which the Persians are known to delight. Example: شاه دین پناه کیوان بارگاه جمشید حشم عطارد رقم فلک پایه خورشید سایه دین پرور معدلت گستر; &c. Of its omission in poetry, the following is one among many examples. ترا یاری است سنگین دل ستمگر سست پیمانی; &c.

RULE NINTH.

If two or more attributives shall be connected together by means of the intervention of the copulative conjunction, the sound of the conjunction will be that of Zumma added to the letter which immediately precedes it. Example: باده گلرنگ و تلخ و تیز و خوش خوار و سبک; &c But though the introduction of the conjunction is here supported by the authority of Hafiz, I think it better, on general principles, to employ the

the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی in such cases; that so the موصوف with all its attributives may form, as it were, a single noun significant of a certain specific object. And if the attributives shall happen to be employed, not as the صفت, but merely as the predicate of a given subject, the conjunction may then supply advantageously the place of the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی.

EXAMPLE.

نازک بدن و لاله رخ و سنگین دل
شیرین سخن و لطیف و سیمین ساق است

RULE TENTH.

If the موصوف shall happen to precede the صفت, the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی must then be omitted. Examples: نیک مرد "A good man;" فراوان نشاط "Abundant joy;" دادگر شاه "A just king;" بی پایان انبساط "Endless delight;" &c. But both may be followed by an adjective noun; in which case, they must be connected with such adjective by means of the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی. Example: نیک مرد خوش خلق "A good man of an agreeable temper;" &c.

RULE ELEVENTH.

The introduction of the letter یای مجهول, or of the substantive verb, or of the relative که, between a given substantive noun and the following attributive which is imputed to it, will necessarily supercede the use of the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی. Examples: مردی بزرگ "A venerable man;" مرد است جاهل or مردی است جاهل "He is an ignorant man;" دل که طومار وفا بود "My heart which was a volume of constancy;" &c. But if the صفت shall be divided from the substantive noun to which it is imputed, by means

 of

of the intervention of what has been termed the صلهٔ صفت, or its متعلقات, the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی must then be inserted. Examples; دل از دنیا گریزان "A heart flying from the world;" مرد براه راست رونده "A man walking in the right road;" دل بسوی ما لا یعنی مایل "A heart inclining to trifles;" خاطر سخت فاتر "A very weary mind;" عالم فرق کنندهٔ نیک از بد "A learned man discriminating good from bad;" &c. For in these last examples, the صفت is considered as a compound epithet, the parts of which, taken together, form, as it were, a single attributive applicable to the موصوف with which it is connected. Perhaps the purport of this rule may be better expressed, as follows. The intervention of any one or more words connected with the موصوف, will prevent the application to the latter, of the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی; but if the intervening words shall belong to the صفت, the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی must be inserted.

RULE TWELFTH.

It has been said, that the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی may be omitted after a substantive occurring between two adjective nouns; as in the following example from the poet Khosro. بیچاره خسرو خسته را خون ریختن فرموده است "She has given orders to shed the blood of the poor and wretched Khosro." I know of no other example by which the accuracy of this rule can be supported, and this example is insufficient for the purpose. It may be scanned as follows: مستفعلن : بیچاره خس and so on through the rest of the line. But the rules of prosody authorize the substitution of مفاعلن for مستفعلن in any one of the ارکان, or pillars of the verse; and thus the word خسرو may receive the vowel کسره, or otherwise, according to the pleasure of every reader; as thus: مستفعلن : رو خسته را ; or خسته را

مُشْتَاقَانْ ; رُوخَسْتَه رَا. From which it follows, that the poet, in all probability, did not mean to authorise the omission of Kusra, after the word خُسْرُو. It is certain, at least, that the omission of that vowel point, in such cases, must be considered as a rare occurrence.

RULE THIRTEENTH.

The vowel كَسْرَهٔ تَوْصِيفِي is generally omitted in the case of certain compounded words; such as مُرْغَابِي for مُرْغِ آبِي literally "A water fowl;" and now, in the course of time, become, as it were, the substantive name of all the wild birds of the web-footed species.

RULE FOURTEENTH.

Of the disjunctive pronouns, the word مَنْ may be followed by any given attributive, with which it must be connected by means of the intervention of the vowel كَسْرَهٔ تَوْصِيفِي. Example: نَاصِحَا بَا مَنِ دِيوَانَه مَكُنْ گُفْتُ وشُنُودْ "O my admonisher, talk not with a madman such as I am!" مَرْدِ عَاقِلْ نَكُنَدْ عَرْبَدَه بَا مَرْدُمِ مَسْتْ "For a wise man will not wrangle with him that is drunk." After مَرَا, the vowel كَسْرَهٔ تَوْصِيفِي must be omitted. Example: گَرْ مَرَا زَارْ بَه كُشْتَنْ بَرَدْ آن يَارِ عَزِيزْ "If my beloved mistress should carry me who am weak and helpless to be slaughtered." After ما and شُمَا the attributive must be put into the plural number. Examples: شُمَا زِيرَكَانْ "You, who are intelligent;" مَا تَوَانْگَرَانْ "We, who are rich;" &c. The vowel كَسْرَه must be omitted after the word تُو. Example: بِيچَارَه كَه دِلْ بِتُو نَامِهْرَبَانْ دِهَدْ "The wretch who bestows his heart on thee unkind;" &c. The third personal pronoun is seldom or never followed by an attributive of any kind.

CONCLUSION.

CONCLUSION.

The rules of concord by which, in many Languages, an adjective is made to agree with a substantive in gender, number and case, are unknown to the purity of the Persian Tongue; *first*, because the accidents of case and gender are wholly inapplicable to Persian adjectives; and, *secondly*, because it is a rule of the Language that the substantive must be omitted, whenever an adjective is put into the plural number. Examples: دلاوران or مردان دلاور (never مردان دلاوران) "The brave;" خوب رویان or زنان خوب رو (never زنان خوب رویان) "The beautiful;" &c. And for several ages after the introduction of Arabic words into the Persian Language, it does not appear that any regard was paid to the rules of concord, which are generally, and in my opinion properly, rejected even at this day. Examples: دوستان صادق "Faithful friends;" نکتهای عجیب "Wonderful subtilties;" مطالب صوری "Worldly or external objects;" مقاصد معنوی "Spiritual, internal, or essential matters;" &c.

In process of time some examples have nevertheless been borrowed from the Arabs, of the concordance, in point of number, between a given attributive and the substantive noun to which it is imputed; as کلمات طیبات "Pleasant words;" رقایم کرایم "Generous letters;" درر غرر "Brilliant pearls;" خواطر عواطر "Beneficent" or literally "Odoriferous minds;" &c. These examples are by no means numerous; and they have been adopted, apparently, for the sake of the gingle in which the Persian are known to delight. It would be no breach of grammatical accuracy to put the adjective, in every example of this class, into the form of the masculine gender of the singular number, but the feminine gender will be often employed; as کلمات طیبه ; رقایم کریمه ; &c. &c. for the reasons now about to be detailed.

It is a rule of Arabic Grammar that an adjective ſingular, in the feminine gender, will generally agree with a ſubſtantive in the plural number, under any of its imperfect forms; as اوصاف حميده "Praiſe worthy attributes;" and other examples of the ſame claſs. A ſubſtantive noun feminine by nature, or by means of the termination تاي تانيث, requires alſo that the adjective ſhould be put into the feminine gender; as هند حسنه "The handſome Hind;" حكمه كامله "Perfect wiſdom;" &c. &c.

Neither of theſe rules are of *neceſſary* obſervance in the Perſian Language; and they are generally diſregarded by ancient writers, who have moſt commonly aſcribed the maſculine ſingular form of an Arabic attributive to all nouns without exception, whether maſculine or feminine, Arabic or Perſian, ſingular or plural. Examples: زن صاحب جمال "A beautiful woman;" زنان صاحب جمال "Beautiful women;" لقمه لطيف "A pleaſant morſel;" اوصاف جميل "Good diſpoſitions;" حكايات لطيف "Pleaſant ſtories;" مسايل مشكل "Difficult problems;" &c. But though not of neceſſary, they muſt be conſidered of *optional* obſervance; ſince the examples of their operation are very numerous in moſt of the compoſitions of modern times: as رقيمهٔ كريمه "A generous letter;" حكمت كامله "Perfect wiſdom;" حكايات لطيفه "Pleaſant ſtories;" مسايل مشكله "Difficult problems;" &c. &c. And of their application to Perſian ſubſtantive nouns in the feminine gender, or in the plural number, many examples might be adduced; ſuch as زن جميله "A beautiful woman;" دختر شكيله "A handſome girl;" خانهاي معموره "Inhabited houſes;" and other combinations of the ſame nature.

It follows from the preceding obſervations; *firſt*, that there is no ſuch thing as the concord of gender number and caſe, between

a given ſubſtantive and the PERSIAN attributive which is imputed to it; and, *ſecondly*, that in the caſe of an ARABIC attributive, the rules of concord may be diſregarded without a breach of grammatical accuracy, ſince they are of *optional* but not of *neceſſary* obſervance. In my opinion, the non-exiſtence of gender, in Perſian attributives, will generally furniſh a ſufficient reaſon for diſregarding the exiſtence of gender in thoſe Arabic adjectives that are of common occurrence in the Perſian Tongue; and there are, perhaps, but two caſes, in which a Perſian ſcholar ought reaſonably to have recourſe to the diſtinctions of gender; namely, *firſt*, for the purpoſe of diſpelling obſcurity; and, *ſecondly*, in particular phraſes, in compliance with the eſtabliſhed uſage of the Language. To explain by examples. In the abſence of a given ſubſtantive noun, the diſtinctions of gender will be often uſeful; as فاسقه, for زن فاسقه or زن فاسق, (as oppoſed to مرد فاسق) "An abandoned woman;" &c. and there are certain phraſes, as نامهٔ کریمه, "A generous letter," in which the uſe of the feminine gender may perhaps be conſidered as fully eſtabliſhed by the authority of preſcription. The words نامهٔ کریم, are undoubtedly accurate in a grammatical point of view, but the maſculine ſeems nevertheleſs to have been generally ſuperceded by the *feminine* gender, in this and other individual phraſes, which can be known only by dint of experience.

IT remains to remark the purpoſed omiſſion, in this chapter, of a ſubject in itſelf of the higheſt importance; *namely*, the DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER of an Arabic or Perſian attributive, as oppoſed to the attributives of the Engliſh and other European Tongues. The ſubject unqueſtionably belongs to this chapter, more properly than to any other part of the work; but the neceſſity of explaining to the Engliſh reader, the true nature of a Perſian attributive, was very early impreſſed on my mind; and the ideas which I have formed on that ſubject are detailed accordingly, in the firſt volume, page 147 et ſeq. to the end of

the

the chapter. I am satisfied that the general opinions, there stated, will stand the test of rigid enquiry; and duly understood and digested by the reader, will easily enable him to account for every important peculiarity in the use and application of Persian attributives; such as the frequent omission of a given substantive noun, and the employment of an attributive, whether simple or complex, to supply its place, &c. An attributive so employed will often receive, like any other substantive, the indefinite article; the prepositions; the termination را; and the sign of the plural number: as دِلِ اَز دَسْت رَفْتَه ; دِلِ اَز دَسْت رَفْتَگان ; دِلِ اَز دَسْت رَفْتَه رَا ; اَى دِلِ اَز دَسْت رَفْتَه ; &c.

Having detailed, as above mentioned, the general principles by which the accuracy of the application of a given attributive to a given substantive noun appears to be determined in the Persian Language, I shall not now waste the time of my readers by the repetition of what is there stated, or by the multiplication of individual examples, which themselves will be easily able to select. I therefore conclude this Chapter with one general observation, namely, that the Persian Language follows the order of nature, by ascribing simple attributives to those nouns only in which the imputed attributives are found to exist; (as PREGNANCY only to the female sex, WISDOM only to rational beings, &c.) and that the English Language admits the application of any adjective, not only to those nouns in which the imputed attributive may happen to exist, but also to all nouns, without exception, with which it has any conceivable relation; as KINDNESS to a letter; WISDOM to a law; HUMANITY to an institution; or VIRTUE to an action; &c. The difference between them consists, therefore, in the specific or indefinite relations which the adjectives of either Language are respectively formed to denote. Our adjectives denote invariably an INDEFINITE RELATION, and Persian adjectives denote almost invariably a SPECIFIC RELATION; with the exception, however, of those which belong to the class termed مَنْسُوب

or

or RELATIVE NOUNS. The figurative application of adjectives to nouns in which the imputed attribute has no real, but only a figurative exiſtence, is undoubtedly common to both Tongues; but the figures of one Language will be often unintelligible in another Tongue, and therefore the Learner ſhould be ſparing in the uſe of figures (as A SMILING GARDEN for example) unſupported by the authority of preſcription.

I NOW proceed to conſider the rules that regard the application of the اِسْمِ تَفْضِيل to the purpoſes of ſpeech.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

اِسْمِ تَفْضِيل

OR

NOUN OF SUPERIORITY.

ALL the Attributives of every Language may be divided into thoſe which are POSITIVE; as MALE, FEMALE, ROUND, SQUARE, FULL, EMPTY, &c. and into thoſe which are RELATIVE; as GOOD, WISE, JUST, VIRTUOUS, and other examples of the ſame nature. An attributive of the firſt claſs is naturally unſuſceptible of the degrees of compariſon, becauſe, in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the terms, it muſt be incapable of intenſion and remiſſion; as when we affirm that "Every woman is equally Female;" or in other words, that one individual cannot be more or leſs female than every other individual of the ſame ſex. And if the words ROUND, SQUARE, FULL, EMPTY, &c. were uſed in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the terms, they would be alſo incapable of intenſion and remiſſion; becauſe nothing is perfectly round which is not abſolutely a mathematical circle, and conſequently nothing can be more than round. But we are accuſtomed, in common ſpeech, to apply the term ROUND to every figure which

is nearly circular; and on that principle it may be accurately affirmed that either of two given figures is ROUNDER, that is to ſay, MORE NEARLY CIRCULAR, than the other with which we have occaſion to compare it. With the exception of the words MALE and FEMALE, I conceive, therefore, that all the adjectives of the firſt claſs are commonly uſed in a relative ſenſe, and therefore admit the degrees of compariſon.

AND every adjective of the ſecond claſs, denoting an idea merely relative, muſt be therefore capable of intenſion and remiſſion; (termed by the Perſian شدّت وضعف) and will conſequently admit the degrees of compariſon. For as the ſame temperature of the atmoſphere will excite the oppoſite ſenſations of heat and cold in the ſame individual at different times, or in different individuals at the ſame time, ſo it muſt be obvious, that there is no point in the ſcale of the Thermometer at which heat can be abſolutely and excluſively ſaid to begin, nor any point ſo high as to exclude the idea of yet greater heat. The ſame thing happens ſo obviouſly in the caſe of WISDOM, VIRTUE, JUSTICE, MERCY, &c. &c. that it would be a waſte of time to enlarge on the ſubject; and I ſhall therefore merely obſerve, that every adjective of the ſecond claſs ſeems to imply a tacit compariſon, even when employed in the poſitive degree. For we never aſcribe to a man the epithets of JUST, WISE, GREAT, VIRTUOUS, &c. until we have firſt approved of his juſtice, wiſdom, greatneſs, or virtue; and this I believe we cannot do, otherwiſe than by comparing his eminence in thoſe attributes with the uſual ſtandard of ordinary men. Accordingly, the poſitive is often found in the Hindooſtanee Language to uſurp the place of the comparative and ſuperlative degrees; and in the Perſian Tongue there is one ſolitary adjective, namely, the word به *Good*, in which the ſame principle may be often obſerved to operate; as خاموشی به از سخن بد است "Silence is better than evil ſpeaking;" وسخن نیک به از خاموشی "And ſpeaking well is better than ſilence;" &c.

With this exception, the degrees of comparison are seldom found, in the Persian Language, to usurp the places of each other; and, on the contrary, the use and application of each degree will be found to accord very nearly with that of the corresponding degree of an English adjective.

The term اِسْمِ تَفْضِيل is applied indiscriminately to mark the comparative and superlative degrees; and of the two nouns compared together by its means, the first or superior noun is termed مُفَضَّل; as opposed to the second, which is the مُفَضَّل عَلَيْهِ. If it be affirmed, for example, that "Zyde is more learned than Amr;" Zyde will then be the مُفَضَّل as opposed to Amr, who is the مُفَضَّل عَلَيْهِ.

The following are all the rules that I have been able to collect in the Persian Language, regarding the application of the اِسْمِ تَفْضِيل to the purposes of speech.

RULE FIRST.

Two nouns compared together by means of the اِسْمِ تَفْضِيل in the superlative degree, must be generally of the same class; and the last (being in the plural number) will be invariably connected with the اِسْمِ تَفْضِيل by means of the relation of the genetive case. Examples: خُوبْتَرِينِ لِبَاسْهَا زِرَه اَسْت "Armour is the best of clothes;" وَ بِهْتَرِينِ تَاجْهَا خُود "And a helmet is the best of crowns;" &c. A collective noun in the singular number may yet follow the اِسْمِ تَفْضِيل; as بِهْتَرِينِ قَوْم "The best of the tribe;" &c. And the same thing happens in the case of certain generic nouns; as بِهْتَرِينِ آب 'The best kind of water;" خُوشْتَرِينِ هَوَا "The most pleasant kind of air;" &c.

RULE

RULE SECOND.

There are ſome exceptions to the preceding rule; ſuch as یوسف نیکوترین برادران خود است "Joseph is the moſt beautiful of his brethren," which is held to be accurate, although Joseph is not among the number of his own brothers. The Perſian Grammarians probably ſuppoſe that there is here a juſtifiable elipſis: "Joseph is the moſt beautiful of (the men) his brethren;" and they will not ſuffer the critics to conſider as a blemiſh, an omiſſion ſo eaſily ſupplied by the underſtanding of the reader. Mr. Addison has condemned a ſimilar expreſſion of Milton; "The faireſt of her daughters Eve," becauſe Eve is not among the number of her own daughters. Milton, however, has ſupplied the elipſis:— "The Goodlieſt he, of men ſince born his ſons; the faireſt of her daughters Eve;" that is to ſay, the faireſt Eve of women ſince born her daughters; &c.

RULE THIRD.

The مفضل علیه is often rejected after an اسم تفضیل in the ſuperlative degree; the noun employed to ſupply its place being inſerted for the mere purpoſe of explaining ſome circumſtance relating to the مفضل with which it is connected. The مفضل علیه muſt be ſupplied, in this caſe, by the underſtanding of the reader. To explain by an Example. The words فردوسی فصیح ترین طوس است may doubtleſs ſignify "Ferdousee is the beſt poet (not of Perſia but merely) of Toos;" in which caſe the word طوس, or اهل طوس, will no doubt be the مفضل علیه. But the ſentence may alſo ſignify, in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of every well informed native, that "Ferdousee is the beſt of the Perſian poets;" the word طوس being introduced merely for the purpoſe of denoting the place of his reſidence which happened to be Toos. In this caſe, the

the sense of the sentence may be rendered as follows: فردوسی از اهل طوس افصح الشعرای فارسی است " FERDOUSEE of Toos is the best of the Persian poets;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

THE اسم تفضیل in the comparative degree is commonly followed by the preposition از: as زید دانا تر از بکر است " ZYDE is wiser than BUKR;" &c. But sometimes, though rarely, the mark of the اضافت may be observed in this case to supercede the use of the preposition از: as با کوچک تر خود همسری نباید کرد " Do not put yourself on an equality with him who is meaner than yourself;" &c. Two nouns compared together by means of the اسم تفضیل in the comparative degree, are not necessarily of the same class; but they must participate in the same attribute, as when we compare the swiftness of a horse with that of a camel or any other animal; &c.

RULE FIFTH.

THE sense of two sentences may be compared together by means of the اسم تفضیل in the comparative degree; as خاموشی بهتر از سخن بد است " Silence is better than evil speaking; " &c. Or the مفضل علیه may be a demonstrative noun, referring to the following sentence with which it is connected by means of a relative pronoun. Example:
ذره حقیر از آن نازل تر است که زبان به مخاطبه احباب گشاید " This poor atom is too humble to open his mouth in conversation with thee;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

THE مفضل may be accurately and elegantly omitted, whenever the omission can be easily supplied by the understanding of the reader.

EXAMPLE.

EXAMPLE.

چنان در جودت وحسن بیان فرد

که آن خوشتر تصور کم توان کرد

" So eminent for acuteness and eloquence that (nothing) can be easily conceived more delightful than it is." And the same rule is applicable to the مفضّل علیه ; as خدای تعالی دانا تر و بینا تر است " God is the wisest (of Beings);" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

The اسم تفضیل , in either degree, may be employed as a simple adjective noun; having the sense of what has been termed the intensive superlative by English Grammarians. Example: سبز تر دارد چمن را التفاتش در خزان " His attention preserves the garden very green even in the season of autumn;"

نگویم گرامی ترین گوهری   سپردم بنامی ترین شوهری

" I will not say that I have given the noblest of ladies to the most renowned of husbands;" &c. In the last example the اسم تفضیل is merely a simple adjective (the noblest lady, the most renowned husband,) applicable to the following substantive noun.

CONCLUSION.

I have now detailed all the rules that regard the application of the اسم تفضیل to the purposes of speech; and with this chapter I conclude that part of the syntax which relates to the use and application of Persian nouns. Of eleven chapters devoted to this subject, the first three are intended to illustrate the nature of nouns abstractedly considered, with reference to the distinction existing between them as PROPER NAMES, GENERIC NOUNS, or NOUNS OF TIME AND PLACE, &c. The seven following chapters are intended to illustrate the nature of nouns considered with refe-

rence

rence to the grammatical character which they are found to assume in the structure of a sentence; as that of the SUBJECT or the PREDICATE of a given proposition; THE AGENT or THE OBJECT of a given verb; the صفت; the موصوف; the مضاف; the مضاف اليه; the حال; the تمييز; the بدل; &c. I am not aware that this arrangement can be improved, since any reader, who has taken the pains to comprehend the scheme of the work, may afterwards easily refer to the chapter that treats of a given subject, on which he desires to obtain information. In that chapter he will be sure to find the subject exhausted to the utmost of my ability; and if he should there fail to obtain the desired information, there is little hope that it will be found anywhere else. I have been ambitious to render this work useful, not merely to beginners, but as a book of reference to those who have made considerable progress in the study of Persian, and with that view have been earnestly desirous to preserve the advantage of a clear arrangement. I now proceed to consider the nature and application of Persian verbs.

OF VERBS.

CHAPTER FIRST.

OF THE VERBAL CHARACTER.

THE following observations on the nature of the verb are borrowed from the Grammatical treatise in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA.

"OF all the constituent parts of speech, none has given the grammarians greater trouble than the VERB. The vast variety of circumstances which it blends together in one word, throws very considerable difficulties in the way of him who attempts to analyse it and ascertain its nature; at the same time, that by its eminent use in Language, it is entitled to all the attention which can be

bestowed

bestowed upon it. To the discussion of the verb, Mr. HARRIS, whose notions of this as of the other parts of speech have been generally adopted by the subsequent writers on Grammar, has dedicated a large proportion of his book; in which he has thrown out many excellent observations, mixed, as it appears to us, with several errors. We have already observed, that no man is ignorant when he uses what is called a VERB and when a NOUN. Every schoolboy knows, that the words IS, LOVETH, WALKETH, STANDETH in English; and EST, AMAT, AMATUR, AMBULAT, STAT, in Latin, are VERBS: he knows likewise that they are of different kinds; that some of them are said to be *active*, some *passive*, and some *neuter*. But it should seem, that the first object of our investigation ought to be the *characteristic* of the verb, or that which all these words have in *common*, and which constitutes them VERBS, distinguishing them from every other species of words. Now it is obvious to the slightest attention, that every verb, whether active, passive, or neuter, may be resolved into the substantive verb IS and another ATTRIBUTIVE: for LOVETH is of the same import with IS LOVING; WALKETH, with IS WALKING; and AMAT, with AMANS EST. But LOVING, WALKING, and AMANS, are not verbs: whence it follows, that the characteristic of the verb, or that which constitutes it what it is, and cannot be expressed by other words, must be that which is signified by the word IS; and to us that appears to be neither more nor less than ASSERTION.

"ASSERTION therefore, or PREDICATION, is certainly the very ESSENCE of the verb, as being that part of its office, and *that part only*, which cannot be discharged by other kinds of words. Every other circumstance which the verb includes, such as *attribute*, *mode*, *time*, &c. it may be possible to express by *adjectives*, *participles*, and *adverbs*; but without a *verb* it is impossible to *predicate*, to affirm or deny, any one thing of any other thing. The office of the verb, then, when stript of all *accidental* circumstances, seems to be merely this, "To join together the subject

and

and predicate of a propofition:" its powers are analogous to thofe of the fign PLUS in Algebra, which does not affect the feparate value of the quantities between which it is placed, but only indicates their *union* or *coalefcence.* To explain by an example: when we fay, *Cicero eloquens, Cicero wife;* thefe are imperfect fentences, though they denote a fubftance and an attribute. The reafon is, that they want an affertion, to fhow that fuch an attribute appertains to fuch a fubftance. But when we infert the word *was*, we join the fubftance and attribute together; we give notice that the *wifdom* and *eloquence* are applied to CICERO, and we do thing more: we neither increafe the wifdom nor diminifh it, we neither make it real nor imaginary; for it was fuppofed in all its extent when the words *Cicero* and *wife* ftood independent of each other. We may indeed ufe the verb in a form which implies not an *affertion* only but likewife an *attribute;* as when we fay, *George writeth,* or *George walketh*: but as *whitenefs* or any other particular colour is not of the *effence* of a *horfe*, an animal which is found of all colours; fo in the phrafes quoted, the *attribute*, though implied, is not of the *effence* of the verb; for it may be equally well expreffed by other words: *George is writing,* and *George is walking,* are phrafes of the very fame import with *George writeth* and *George walketh.*

"IN refolving every verb, whether active, paffive or neuter, into the fubftantive verb IS and another *attributive* we have the honour to agree with all the Grammarians; but to the word IS itfelf the learned author of HERMES has given a meaning which, as a verb, it does not admit. He obferves, that before any thing can be the fubject of a propofition, it muft *exift*: that all exiftence is either *abfolute* or *qualified, mutable* or *immutable*: that the verb IS can by itfelf exprefs *abfolute exiftence,* but never the *qualified,* without fubjoining the particular form; and that it fignifies both *mutable* and *immutable* exiftence, having in thefe cafes different meanings; although the fentences which he gives as examples are evidently conftructed in the fame manner and confift of the fame

parts

parts of speech. His examples are: of *absolute* existence, B IS; of *qualified*, B IS an *animal*; of *mutable*, *This orange* IS *ripe*; of *immutable*, *the diameter of the square* IS *incommensurable with its side*. But if PREDICATION be the essence of verb, all this is nothing to the purpose, and part of it is not true. It is not true that the verb IS ever varies its signification; for it hath as *verb* no connection with existence of any kind. All such circumstances are superadded to its verbal nature; or, to speak more accurately, we infer such circumstances from our previous knowledge of the objects concerning which the predication is made. When we say, "*this* orange IS ripe," we do indeed mean, as Mr. HARRIS observes, that *it is so now at this present* in opposition to *past* and *future* time: but it is not the verb IS, but the definitive THIS, which fixes the *time* of *maturity*, as well as the *place* of the orange; for had we said, *oranges* ARE *ripe*, we might have been properly asked, *when* and *where* are they ripe? although the same verb is used in both sentences. Even in the sentence "B IS," absolute existence (the most simple of all) is *inferred*, and not *expressed*, by the *verb*; and the inference is made from this obvious principle, "That when one utters a mark of *predication*, we naturally conclude that he means to predicate *something* of the subject. If he adds no *specific* predication, as B IS ROUND, we apply to B the most general that we can; and what other species is so general as *existence*?

THAT the idea of existence, considered as *mutable* or *immutable*, is not contained in the verb IS itself, but is derived from our knowledge of the objects concerning which the predication is made, appears manifestly from this: That if a person be supposed ignorant of the meaning of the words GOD and MAN, whilst he knows that of IS; the uttering of the two propositions, *God is happy*, and *this man is happy*, will give him no notice of existence considered as *mutable* or *immutable*, *temporary* or *eternal*. His conclusion with respect to these modes of existence, if any such conclusion be drawn at all, must be derived entirely from his

previous knowledge of the nature of GOD and the nature of MAN.

SOME of our readers may poſſibly think this notion of verb too abſtract and metaphyſical; yet what other circumſtance than *mere predication* is eſſential to that ſpecies of word? We ſay *eſſential;* for we are here inquiring, not what is expreſſed by each *individual verb*, but what it is which is equally expreſſed by *all verbs*, and which diſtinguiſhes them from the *other parts of ſpeech.* And if it be true, that every thing which the verb implies, *predication alone excepted*, may be expreſſed by other parts of ſpeech, and that *no other part of ſpeech* can *predicate;* then we think ourſelves warranted to affirm, that *ſimple predication* is the *eſſential characteriſtic* of VERB, that every word which predicates IS A VERB, and that *nothing* is ſo which does *not predicate.*

IT muſt not, however, be concealed, that a doctrine very different from this has been lately maintained by a writer of diſtinguiſhed abilities. "We have *energy* expreſſed," ſays Dr. GREGORY, "and of courſe a verb conſtituted, *without affirmation*, when we wiſh or command; without *command*, when we affirm or wiſh; without *wiſh*, when we command or affirm: yet in all theſe caſes we have equally and indiſputably a verb."

THAT in all theſe caſes we have a *verb*, is indeed indiſputable; but we hold it to be equally indiſputable, that in all theſe caſes we have *affirmation.* The ingenious author has given no direct example of a *wiſh* or *command uttered without affirmation*; and a feeling or ſentiment which is *not uttered*, has nothing to do with language: but he has given a ſentence in which there are three verbs, that in his opinion denote *no affirmation*, but a very plain *ſuppoſition.* If a *ſuppoſition* can be expreſſed without affirmation, we ſhall very readily allow that a *wiſh* or *command* may be ſo expreſſed likewiſe. The Doctor's ſuppoſition is thus expreſſed: "*Had* any puniſhment ever overtaken you for your broken

vows;

vows; *were* but one of your teeth growing black, or even *were* but one of your nails growing lefs beautiful, I fhould believe you."

It is almoft fuperfluous to obferve, that to every *verb* not in the infinitive mode there muft be a *nominative*, and to every *active* verb an *object*, whatever be the arrangement of the fentence in which fuch verbs are found. Thefe are truths known to every fchoolboy; the reafons of them fhall be given afterwards. It is likewife undeniable, that in the fentence before us, the nominative To *Had* is *any punifhment*; to the firft *were*, *one of your teeth*; and to the fecond, *one of your nails*. But the fentence arranged in grammatical order, with the feveral nominatives before their refpective verbs, is evidently *elliptical*; and the conjunction *if* muft be fupplied as well to complete the conftruction as to make fenfe of the paffage. "*If* any punifhment had ever overtaken you; *if* but one of your teeth were growing black, or even *if* but one of your nails were growing lefs beautiful, I fhould believe you." Now it has lately been proved, by fuch evidence as leaves no room for doubt, that *if*, though called a *conjunction*, is in fact a *verb* in the imperative mode, of the fame import with *give*; fo that we may fubftitute the one for the other without in the fmalleft degree altering the fenfe. The fentence will then run thus: "*Give*, any punifhment had ever overtaken you; *give* but one of your teeth were growing black, &c. I fhould believe you." It is therefore fo far from being true, that HAD and WERE, when the fentence is completed, exprefs *no* affirmation; that it is only upon *granting* the *truth* of the *affirmation* which *they denote*, that the fpeaker fays "I fhould believe you." "Any punifhment had ever overtaken you," is plainly an affirmation; *if*, *give* that affirmation, *admit its truth*, "I fhould believe you."

BUT it cannot be fuppofed that HAD and WERE change their fignifications by a mere change of place, or that by being removed from the *middle* to the *beginning* of a claufe, they *lofe* their *original import*, and come to denote fomething *entirely different*.

ferent. Were this the case, every attempt to ascertain and fix the general principles of Grammar would be as ridiculous as an attempt to arrest the course of time. For what purpose then, it may be asked, if the verb *always* denotes *affirmation*, is it removed from the middle to the beginning of the clause, when *supposition* is implied as in the present instance? We answer, that supposition is neither more, nor less than *conditional affirmation*; that when such affirmation is *completely* expressed, the verb is *not* removed to the beginning of the clause; and that such removal takes place *only* when the clause is *elliptical*, being merely an artificial contrivance in language, to shew the reader or hearer that some such word as *if*, demanding the truth of the affirmation, is *omitted* for the sake of dispatch. This is evident; for when the word requiring the affirmation to be granted is *supplied*, the verb must be restored to its place in the middle of the clause. Such abbreviations, and such contrivances to mark them, are frequent in all languages, as will be seen more clearly when we come to treat of modes. Upon the whole, notwithstanding the deference which we willingly pay to this very masterly writer, we are compelled reluctantly to differ from him, and still to think that *simple predication* is the *very essence of the* VERB.

SHOULD we be required to exemplify our theory by language, and to produce instances of this simplified verb in practice, we might answer, that the not being able to produce such instances would be no good argument against the truth of our principles. It is the nature of language to express many circumstances by the same word, all of which however are not *essential* to distinguish the *species* to which that word belongs from the *other species* of words; and it is the nature of man to *infer* from discourse many things which are not *actually expressed*. Perhaps, however, something nearly approaching to an exemplification of our idea of a *simple verb* will be found in the following proposition: "The three angles of every plane triangle are equal to two right angles." What other office, the verb *are* here performs than

simply

ſimply to join the ſubject and predicate, it is difficult to perceive. It does not give notice of *time*; or ſuch notice, if given, is an imperfection; for the truth of the propoſition is independent on time. Neither ought it to imply *exiſtence*; for the propoſition would be true, were there neither a triangle nor a right angle in nature.

"THIS idea of verb, when it is well conſidered, we hope will be found juſt; but ſhould any of our readers ſuſpect it of novelty, and on that account be diſpoſed to condemn it, we have only to requeſt that he will reſtrain his cenſure till he has examined the writings of others, and nicely obſerved the ſeveral poſtures of his own mind in diſcourſe; for meditation may perhaps ſhow him that our theory is not falſe, and inquiry will ſatisfy him that it is not novel."

* * * * *

BELIEVING that every aſſertion muſt by its very nature be partly or wholly true or falſe, I conceive the term ASSERTION is improperly uſed to denote the ſuppoſed eſſential characteriſtic of a verb. If I ſay to a ſervant "I deſire you will bring me a glaſs of water," there is here a direct aſſertion of my own deſire; (my deſire is that you ſhall bring me a glaſs of water;) but if I ſubſtitute for theſe words, "Bring me a glaſs of water," there is then merely a ſimple COMMAND which is neither true nor falſe; becauſe no command, expreſſed by means of a verb in the imperative mode, can be open to the ſuſpicion of truth or falſhood. The aſſertion of my own deſires may indeed be inferred from the commands which I utter in the imperative mode; becauſe no man commands that which he does not deſire; but this is merely an unexpreſſed *inference*, perfectly conſiſtent with what has been ſtated; *namely*, that a verb in the IMPERATIVE, (and ſo alſo of the PRECATIVE, INTERROGATIVE MODES, &c.) does not directly denote ASSERTION, becauſe the ſpeaker cannot, in this caſe, be ſaid to have uttered any thing which is abſolutely and poſitively true or falſe.

THE argument of DOCTOR GREGORY is therefore untouched, in my opinion, by the propofed folution of the preceding example adduced by him. I will grant (though I think there is no neceffity for fuch a conceffion) that the fentence "Had any punifhment ever overtaken you," is in fact elliptical; and that the conjunction IF which is a corrupted imperative of the verb TO GIVE, muft be fupplied in order to complete the fenfe. The words "Any punifhment had ever overtaken you" may be admitted alfo, to convey an affertion, though the fentence fo expreffed is not English in my opinion. "If any punifhment had ever overtaken you" is good Englifh; but the conjunction IF means GIVE; and GIVE is a verb in the imperative mode, which does not therefore denote affertion. We affert nothing but our own defire when we fay to a friend "Give me a book;" and our own defire is not, in this cafe, directly afferted, but merely inferred from the very obvious principle already mentioned; *namely*, that no man commands or folicits that which is contrary to the tenor of his own defires.

THE word PREDICATION is a better term than the word ASSERTION, by which to denote the fuppofed effential characteriftic of a verb. By the word PREDICATION, I underftand "the office "of uniting the fubject and the predicate of a given propofition, "in fuch a manner as to form a perfect fentence, whether conveying "an affertion or not." In this fenfe of the term, the IMPERATIVE, PRECATIVE, and INTERROGATIVE modes, will immediately fall within the definition of a verb, without the neceffity of having recourfe to ellipfis; an engine perhaps too powerful to be ufed with fafety on every occafion. ASSERTION is doubtlefs one fort of PREDICATION; but the latter may exift in the abfence of affertion ("Give me a book;" "Is JAMES learned?" &c. &c.) and therefore conftitutes the better term.

IT may however be reafonably queftioned whether we have any right to fupply an ellipfis to the fentence "Had any punifhment

punishment ever overtaken you;" because the contrivance of prefixing the verb, "HAD," to the nominative, PUNISHMENT, (for any thing I can perceive to the contrary,) does itself affect the sense of the sentence, as clearly as the insertion of the particle IF. In this case, the force of the phrase "Had any punishment ever overtaken you," is equivalent to that expressed by the words "If any punishment had ever overtaken you;" and there is no necessity for having recourse to the aid of an ellipsis at all. If the sentence "Had any punishment ever overtaken you" were truly elliptical, it must be equivalent to the words "Any punishment had ever overtaken you;" and the necessity of supplying the particle IF, would be equally obvious in either case. But the insertion of the particle IF is inconsistent with the inverted order of speech, ("Had any punishment ever overtaken you;") and thence I conclude that the sentence is not elliptical, because this very inversion of the order of speech is itself equivalent to the insertion of IF*.

FOR it must be obvious that the possible modes or inflexions of a verb have not been exhausted in any Language; and though the interrogative, for example, is distinguished from the affirmative mode of an English verb, merely by inverting the order of speech, ("JAMES is learned;" "Is JAMES learned?") it is easy to conceive a Language, in which each of these two modes of the verb might be distinguished by inflexions peculiar to itself. In such a case, the resource of an ellipsis would be of no avail, because the interrogative mode of the verb would be wholly incapable of conveying assertion; that being the office of the affirmative mode, distinguished by a form peculiar to itself. In fact, the opinion of those who supply an ellipsis is obviously founded on the following supposition; *namely*, that the radical import of a given phrase,

* I admit that the inverted order of speech is not *peculiar* to the conditional mode, since the interrogative mode is also formed by inverting the order of speech. This is by no means the only instance, in which the same form of the verb is employed for the accomplishment of more purposes than one.

"JAMES

"JAMES is learned;" "Is JAMES learned?" cannot be affected by any alteration of the order of speech. In my opinion it may be influenced as effectually by changing the order of speech, as it can be by the invention of a new inflexion; and on the decision of this point the merits of the question appear to rest. I shall therefore merely observe, that every conceivable mode of the verb might be distinguished by a form peculiar to itself; from which it follows that the preceding observations, applied by me to the INTERROGATIVE mode, are equally applicable to the CONDITIONAL or any other form of the verb.

"BUT it cannot be supposed that the words HAD and WERE, "change their significations by a mere change of place; or that, "by being removed from the middle to the beginning of a clause, "they lose their original import, and come to denote something "entirely different. Were this the case, every attempt to ascertain "and fix the general principles of Grammar, would be as ridi-"culous as an attempt to arrest the course of time."

I DO not believe that the words HAD and WERE change their significations by a mere change of place; because the sense of each, separately considered, is essentially the same in every example that can be adduced. It is a part of the idea which we entertain of the word WERE, that the nominative may be prefixed or subjoined at pleasure; as "you were;" and "were you;" and that the interrogative, or conditional, or affirmative character of the sentence will generally depend on the order of speech. By this contrivance we might have put questions and stated conditions, &c. even though there were no such word as IF (or GIVE) in existence; and this also is a possible case, in which the resource of an ellipsis would be of no avail. For though it is possible to express a question by having recourse to the aid of the particle IF following a verb in the imperative mode, ("Tell me if" &c.) it is equally obvious to express it by an inversion of the common order of speech;

and

and for any thing I can perceive to the contrary, the expression of the question is equally perfect in either case.

HAVING admitted that the position of the words HAD and WERE has no effect on the abstracted signification of these words, I have nothing to do with the truth or falshood of the proposition contained in the sentence " Were this the case, every attempt to ascertain and fix the general principles of Grammar would be as ridiculous as an attempt to arrest the course of time." It is impossible, however, not to perceive that this is a branch of the same doctrine, by which we are informed that " every word has the same radical import, in every example that can be adduced." And as I have already shewn the falshood of this doctrine, (See Note to Vol. 1st, page 388) I shall only here observe; *first*, that if, by a word, we mean merely A SOUND, then the doctrine is palpably erroneous; as in the case of the word BOX; which signifies *a blow*, and also *a chest of wood*, two ideas which have no assimilation of any kind; and, *secondly*, that if, by a word, we mean THAT WHICH REPRESENTS A GIVEN IDEA, then there may be two words having the same sound; as in the case of the word BOX; which is one word in the sense of *a chest*, and another word in the sense of *a blow**.

WITH regard to the investigation of Grammar, it is sufficient to observe that the grammatical importance of every word depends on the nature of the idea which it is formed to denote; and if it shall so happen, (as it does in truth very frequently happen,) that a given word or sound shall be employed, in a given Language, to denote more ideas than one; then we have only to admit the fact; and to assign it, if necessary, to more

* In the Arabic and Persian Tongues, the sense of a word often depends on that of the preposition with which it is connected; and thus بکاری پرداختن signifies " To undertake or set about the accomplishment of an affair," whereas از کاری پرداختن signifies " To finish an affair which had been previously undertaken."

 than

than one of the parts of ſpeech. The difficulties that relate to the inveſtigation of Grammar will be neither increaſed nor diminiſhed by that operation; nor will the ſcience of Grammar furniſh an object of leſs rational enquiry than it ever did.

All verbs have been juſtly conſidered as one ſpecies of ATTRIBUTIVES; yet if it be true that "ſimple predication is the "eſſential characteriſtic of verb; that every word which predicates "is a verb, and that nothing is ſo which does not predicate;" it muſt be obvious, I think, that the attributive character is accidental and not eſſential to the verb. For a ſimple verb, deprived of its accidents, will be merely, in this caſe, a mark of predication; that is to ſay A CONNECTIVE employed to unite the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition; and, like other connectives, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew that it muſt be aſſigned to the claſs of particles, and not to the claſs of nouns or verbs. To explain by an example. We have the authority of all the Perſian Lexicographers to affirm that the vowel کَسْرَه, ſubjoined to the predicate of a given propoſition, was anciently employed to denote PREDICATION; as زَیْدِ دَبِیر "ZYDE is a writer;" and there is no reaſon whatever to queſtion the accuracy of this information.

But I do not believe that the vowel کَسْرَه is therefore a VERB, or an attributive of any kind; and on the contrary, I think it much more probable that the vowel کَسْرَه is THE SAME PARTICLE, whether employed to indicate the *attributive* relation, as مَرْدِ نِیک "A good man;" or the relation of the *genetive caſe*, as بَرَادَرِ زَیْد "The brother of ZYDE;" or the relation exiſting between the *ſubject* and the *predicate* of a given propoſition, as زَیْدِ دَبِیر "ZYDE is a writer." For the vowel کَسْرَه does not ſpecify the nature of the relation expreſſed by itſelf; but merely indicates the preſence of ſome (no matter what) relation, the nature of which it is our buſineſs to diſcover if we can. And the diſcovery will not be generally a matter of difficulty; being ef-

ſected,

fected, in the caſe of the IZAFUT, according to the principles ſtated in treating of that combination. And in the caſe of the attributive relation, as oppoſed to that which exiſts between the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition, there can be no room for any heſitation; becauſe the vowel كسره, being attributive, muſt be ſubjoined to the ſubſtantive noun, as زيدِ دبير "The writer ZYDE;" whereas it will follow the adjective, as زيدْ دبير "ZYDE *is* a writer;" when the relation happens to be that of the ſubject to the predicate of a given propoſition.

I DEEM this to be a better explanation of the nature of the vowel كسره than any other I am able to offer; and if it be juſt, the following inference (in itſelf ſufficiently probable) muſt be drawn of courſe: *namely*, that as there are connectives in every Language by which IMPERFECT COMBINATIONS are formed, as OF, TO, IN, WITH, BY, FOR; &c. ſo there *may be* in any Language, and in the Perſian Language there formerly *were* connectives (namely, the vowel كسره and the letter نون) by which PERFECT COMBINATIONS were formed; as زيدِ دبير "ZYDE *is* a writer;" زيدْ خوشن "ZYDE *is* happy;" &c. And if a given connective employed to form an *imperfect* combination may be truly a particle, as "a man *of* wiſdom;" "a man *of* virtue;" &c. I can ſee no reaſon why a given connective, employed to form a *perfect* combination, may not be a particle on the ſame principle. The vowel كسره and the letter نون are therefore PARTICLES in my opinion; and if ſo, there is no truth in the propoſition "that every word which predicates muſt be a verb."

IT is true, however, that, "nothing is a verb which does not predicate," and therefore PREDICATION is doubtleſs eſſential to the verbal character.

BUT that is not *neceſſarily* a verb at all, (and is *never*, I think, a *perfect* verb,) which performs no other office but that of ſimple predication

dication alone; otherwiſe the vowel كَسْرَه in the example زَيْدٌ دَبِيرٌ "ZYDE is a writer," muſt be a verb. But no man who is not wedded to a ſyſtem, who has not aſſumed the principle that "every thing which predicates muſt be a verb," (and this is preciſely the point to be proved) will believe that the vowel كَسْرَه is here a verb. Its character is plainly that of a PARTICLE; and there is nothing contrary to reaſon or to common ſenſe in the principle which I have aſſumed; *namely*, that one particle may be employed to eſtabliſh the relation exiſting between the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition; as another particle may be employed to eſtabliſh another relation of a different ſpecies; ſuch, for example, as that expreſſed by the genetive caſe.

IF it be aſked whether the vowel كَسْرَه, in the preceding example, performs any other office than that of SIMPLE PREDICATION; whether it indicates by the means of inflexion, the accidents of *time*; the variations of *perſon*; the diſtinctions of *number*, *mode*, *tenſe*, or *gender*, &c. &c. I anſwer that we have no account of its ability to perform any other office than that of ſimple predication alone; that it has no infinitive, no imperative, no inflexions of mode, number, perſon, tenſe, or gender, by which verbs are commonly diſtinguiſhed; and that there is not, therefore, a ſingle argument (except the mere circumſtance of its employment as a mark of ſimple predication, if that ſhall in truth be deemed an argument,) by which its verbal character can be maintained for a moment. I ſhall now proceed to ſtate, in a few words, the idea which I entertain of the nature and character of a PERFECT VERB.

I CONCEIVE a perfect verb to be a word derived from the infinitive, for the purpoſe of aſcribing (with or without reference to the accident of time,) the ſenſe of that infinitive to a given object or ſubſtantive noun, in ſuch a manner as to form a perfect ſentence, whether conveying an aſſertion or not; as

as JOHN SLEEPETH, or DOES HE SLEEP; JAMES LOVETH, or DOES HE LOVE; and other examples of the ſame nature. But certain verbs, ſuch as the word IS, are often found to aſcribe the ſenſe, not of their own, but of another infinitive, to a given object or ſubſtantive noun; as when we ſay of the DEITY, that "He is the ſame yeſterday, to-day, and for ever;" &c. For it is not BEING or EXISTENCE, but SAMENESS or UNITY, or the poſſeſſion of a nature unſuſceptible of change, which is here doubtleſs aſcribed to the DEITY; and in this caſe, the word IS appears to have loſt a part of that character which is eſſential to the nature of a perfect verb.

WHEN ſo employed, it is accordingly termed AN IMPERFECT VERB by the Perſian Grammarians; and the proceſs by which it has acquired that character, is known to them by the term تجرید. The word تجرید ſignifies TO STRIP; and in its technical application, it means "To baniſh from a word a part of the ſenſe which that word was originally formed to denote." As a perfect verb, the word TO BE means TO EXIST; and in this ſenſe, we predicate the BEING or EXISTENCE of GOD. "GOD IS" forms in itſelf a perfect propoſition; in which, notwithſtanding the oppoſite opinion of certain Grammarians, I do not believe that the predicate is wanting. The predicate (is) being here a perfect verb, affirms the exiſtence of BEING in GOD; and the connective ſenſe, the affirmation implied in the word IS, conſtitutes a part, only, of the idea ſignified by that word; which part we are at liberty to retain, after the ſecond component part of the idea, ſignified by the adjective EXTENT, ſhall have been baniſhed by that operation of the mind which the term تجرید is meant to deſcribe. The influence of تجرید might be illuſtrated by many examples of common occurrence in the Arabic Language; and there is not, probably, any Language in the world, in which this natural operation of the mind may not be obſerved to have ſome effect.

BUT it ſeems to me that there are two ſpecies of imperfect

verbs; the first comprising those already described, which form the link of connexion between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition; as, "JAMES *is* virtuous;" "JAMES *became* rich;" &c. and the second comprising those, commonly termed AUXILIARY, by which we are enabled to modify the sense of a given infinitive, in such a manner as to form, as it were, a tense of the verb to which the auxiliary may happen to be imputed: as "JAMES *can* love;" "JAMES *may* read;" and other examples of the same nature.

THE imperfect verbs of either class are not very numerous in any Language; but though not numerous, they are of constant use and will therefore deserve the attention of the reader. I now proceed to consider the use and application of imperfect verbs.

CHAPTER SECOND.

اَفعَالِ نَاقِصَه

OR

IMPERFECT VERBS.

SECTION FIRST.

اَسْت OR هَسْت Is.

THERE seems to be no difference of sense between these verbs, either of which may assume, occasionally, the character of a perfect verb; (HE IS, OR HE EXISTS;) but that character is more commonly applicable to the verb هَسْت than to the verb اَسْت, in which it is rarely found to occur. Of its occasional occurrence, the following is an example from the GOOLISTAUN of SAADEE: اَز آنجا کِه هِمّت دَرویشان اَست هِمّتی هَمراهِ مَن کُنید; and it would be difficult, perhaps, to produce another. The inflexions of both must have been originally the same: هَسْت ; هَسْتی ; هَسْتَم ; هَستیم

هَسْتِيمْ ; هَسْتِيدْ ; هَسْتَنْدْ : اَسْتَمْ ; اَسْتِي ; اَسْت ; اَسْتِيمْ ; اَسْتِيدْ ; اَسْتَنْدْ : but the verb اَسْتَمْ is now generally contracted into اَمْ ; اِي ; اَسْت ; اِيمْ ; اِيدْ : اَنْدْ ; and the old inflexions are seldom or never used, except occasionally, in combination with the tenses of a Persian verb: as شُنِيدَسْتَمْ ; شُنِيدَسْتِي ; شُنِيدَسْت ; شُنِيدَسْتِيمْ ; شُنِيدَسْتِيدْ ; شُنِيدَسْتَنْدْ ; &c.

It is perfectly obvious that those inflexions are derived from the obsolete infinitive هَسْتَن or اَسْتَن ; by rejecting the letter نون of the infinitive, according to the rule which is applicable to the formation of the PRETERITE TENSE of all Persian verbs. But these verbs are no longer significant of PAST TIME, and have therefore apparently suffered the operation already described by the term تَجْرِيدْ. The sense of past time (as well as the attributive sense) having been rejected by that operation, they are no longer significant of *past*, *present*, or *future* time; but merely (in the nature of a رَابِطْ or CONNECTIVE) indicate the *union* of the subject and the predicate of a given proposition, in such a manner as to form a perfect sentence, without reference to the accident of time.

They are accordingly employed to form a great variety of propositions, the truth of which has no dependence on time; as خُدَا كَرِيمْ اَسْت "God is beneficent," and other similar examples; in stating which, it would be injurious to our conceptions of the truth to introduce the restrictions of time at all. For those restrictions are never usefully introduced into the terms of a proposition which is eternally true; and they are positively injurious, if they convey to the mind of the hearer what seems to be a natural inference from the limitation of a given proposition to past, present, or future time, *namely*, that the proposition is *not* eternally true.

I say this is a natural inference, because the restrictions of time

time anſwer no uſeful purpoſe in Language, but that of diſtinguiſhing the periods at which a given propoſition which is ſometimes true, and ſometimes falſe, may happen to be poſitively true or falſe.

But in the abſence of time expreſſed by the verb, it is probable that *preſent time* will be often inferred; for if the propoſition ſhall be of ſuch a nature as to be ſometimes true and ſometimes falſe, the period if its truth or falſehood *ſhould* be expreſſed by the tenſes of the verb. And if we employ in the ſtatement of ſuch a propoſition a ſimple mark of predication (as the vowel كسرہ or the letter نون) which has no reference to paſt, preſent, or future time; or if we employ a verb (as هست or است) originally ſignificant of paſt time, and ſubſequently uſed as a mark of ſimple predication, having no reference to the accident of time; then I conceive, that in either caſe preſent time will be commonly *inferred* on general principles: and if we mean to indicate paſt or future time, there muſt, I ſuppoſe, be ſomething in the context by which the judgment of the hearer may be led to the truth.

In this caſe, we can trace every ſtep of the proceſs by which the verbs است and هست, originally ſignificant of paſt time, are now often employed to indicate preſent time; but the opinion which I have ſtated is mere hypotheſis, and the reader will therefore adopt or reject it according to the dictates of his own judgment. That the verb است was originally ſignificant of paſt time is, however, a fact for which we have the cleareſt evidence; for independently of the form of the verb itſelf, which is obviouſly that of the preterite tenſe, it is ſtill ſignificant of paſt time when followed by the letter یای مجهول, as in the following example from the گلستان of Saadee: لایق قدر من آنستی که با زاغی بر دیوار باغ خرامان همی رفتمی "It would have ſuited my dignity to have walked with the crow on the

the garden wall;" &c. The words لايق قدر من آنستي are here obviously used for لايق قدر من آن بودي, and there are many other examples of the same nature, as

چو حاتم اگر نیستی قدر وی نبردی کس اندر جهان نام طی

&c. &c.

I now proceed to detail the rules that regulate the application of the verbs است and هست to the purposes of speech; but the subject is rather difficult, and I am by no means certain that the reader will have reason to applaud the success of my endeavours to place it in a clear point of view.

RULE FIRST.

These verbs are indifferently used to unite the extreme terms of a given proposition employed to affirm an eternal truth, or what is believed to be eternally or generally true. Examples: خدا کریم است "God is beneficent;" رای بی قوت فسون است "Understanding without power is of no use;" و قوت بی رای جهل و جنون "And power without wisdom is folly and madness;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

They may be employed to unite the extreme terms of a given proposition which is true in present, as opposed to past and future time. Example: زید رونده است or زید روان است "Zyde is now walking;" &c. But these words may also signify "Zyde is about to walk;" because that which is expected to happen soon is often stated as already present.

RULE THIRD.

They may be employed to unite a given subject with the predicate which is *commonly* or *habitually*, perhaps not *presently*, applicable to it. Example: زید نویسنده است "Zyde is a writer;"

writer;" either occasionally, or by his profession, whether he is writing at present or not.

RULE FOURTH.

They may be employed to unite a given subject with the predicate to which it was *formerly* applicable; the connexion having subsequently ceased to exist. Example: اسکندر رومی است "Alexander *is* a Grecian;" in which case است is obviously convertible with بود; as when we say, with equal accuracy, اسکندر رومی بود "Alexander *was* a Grecian;" &c. &c. The difference between the examples appears to consist in this; that the word is refers the sense of the proposition to the present conceptions which we entertain; whereas the word was refers it to that period of past time in which Alexander happened to live. He still lives a Grecian in our memory, and therefore we employ the verb is; but he has been long dead as a matter of fact, and therefore we employ, also, the verb was.

RULE FIFTH.

The word است may supply the place of the aorist باشد, and will be consequently significant of future time, in both members, or in either member of a conditional sentence, comprising a شرط and a جزا. Examples:

اگر زید تند مزاج است (تند مزاج باشد) کی با بکر سازگار خواهد شد

"If Zyde be of a hasty temper, how is it possible that he can agree with Bukr;"

جوهر اگر در خلاب افتد همچنان نفیس است (نفیس باشد)

"If a Jewel fall into the dirt, it will yet be valuable;"

دلبر اگر در پی چنین دل آزاری است (دل آزاری باشد) کجا با او صورت سازگاری است (صورت سازگاری باشد)

"If my mistress continue to treat me thus, how is it possible that I can submit;" &c.

RULE

RULE SIXTH.

THE same rule is optionally applicable to both members, or to either member of a sentence comprising a general proposition expressed by means of a relative pronoun. Example:

هر کرا دشمن در پیش است (ور پیش باشد)
اگر نکشد دشمن خویش است (دشمن خویش باشد)

"Whoever has (or shall have) an enemy to deal with, if he kill him not, IS (or WILL BE) his own enemy;" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

THE same rule is optionally applicable to every sentence comprising two members, of which the duration of one is limited by that of the other. Example: امل آز تا زنده است (تا زنده باشد) در جان کندن گرفتار است (گرفتار باشد) "An avaricious man, while he lives, (or shall live) continues (or will continue) to be miserable;" &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

THE preterperfect tense of every Persian verb is formed by compounding the past participle with the verb است: as کرده است ; رفته است ; گفته است ; &c. And in this case, است may be optionally employed to supply the place of the aorist باشد in any given proposition, which, though future, is yet believed to be of certain occurrence. Examples:

فردا است که خامهٔ اجل ناگهان خط بطلان بر نقش این و آن کشیده است (کشیده باشد) "It is to-morrow that the pen of sudden death shall have drawn (has drawn) the line of expunction over the characters of animated nature;". و پستی مرتبهٔ شاه و گدا از تندی سیلاب فنا هموار و یکسان گردیده است (گردیده باشد) "And that the rank of the king and the begger shall have been reduced to a level (has become even) by the sweeping torrent of mortality;" &c.

REMARKS.

REMARKS.

It may perhaps be contended by certain Grammarians, that the use of the past tense گردیده است، کشیده است, depends, in these examples, on the following principle: *namely*, that the events comprised in either proposition are considered as *past* with reference to that period of *future* time which the word فردا is meant to express. "When tomorrow shall be present, these events will then be past". The fact may be true, but there are many examples in which we cannot have recourse to that kind of argument, such as the following from the Goolistaun of Saadee:

نماند حاتم طائی ولیک تا بابد بماند نام بلندش به نیکوئی مشهور

"Hatime Taee lives no longer (has not remained), but his reputation will survive (has survived) for his virtue to all *future* eternity." Now it is obvious that his reputation has not *yet* survived to all future eternity, and that there is no period of future time at which it can be truly said to have *already* survived to all future eternity; and therfore it is, that an Englishman must in this case employ the future tense of the verb: "His reputation *will* survive to all future eternity." But I ask why it happens that Persian idiom admits in the example before us the employment of the past tense of the verb; and to this question I conceive it will be impossible to return any other than the following answer; *namely*, that the reputation of Hautim is already established; that the speaker believes it will endure for ever, and that the idiom and genius of the Persian Language admits the use of the past tense in the statement of this and every other proposition, which, though future, is nevertheless deemed to be of certain occurrence. I think it necessary to remark, for the benefit of those readers who are little acquainted with the niceties of Persian idiom, that ماند is here certainly in the past tense; and that the measure of the verse will not, in the example before us, admit the substitution of the aorist ماند.

RULE

RULE NINTH.

The word است , compounded with the paſt or paſſive participle of a Perſian verb, does by no means form invariably the preterperfect tenſe of the verb. On the contrary, the context muſt determine whether or not the participle is to be conſidered as a component part of that tenſe, or merely as a ſimple adjective noun: as مرده است "He *has* died," or "He *is* dead;" خفته است "He *has* ſlept;" or "He *is* aſleep;" &c. &c. Example:

ترا بینم از هرچه پرداخته ست که هستی تو سازنده او ساخته ست

"I ſee thee in every thing which *is* created! that thou art the CREATOR, and it *is* thy work." It muſt be obvious to the reader that the participles پرداخته and ساخته , are here conſidered as ſimple adjective nouns.

RULE TENTH.

The verb است may coaleſce with a noun ſignificant of any given period of *paſt*, *preſent*, or *future* time; as فردا است "It is to-morrow;" دیروز است "It was yeſterday;" امروز است "It is to-day;" &c. &c. So alſo in French, "C'eſt hièr;" "C'eſt demain;" "C'eſt aujourd'hui;" &c. on a principle which I do not perfectly underſtand. I am diſpoſed to believe that است is thus capable of coaleſcing with nouns ſignificant of paſt, preſent and future time, becauſe it is itſelf no longer ſignificant of time. Perhaps too, what has been commonly termed the *preſent* tenſe of the verb is in fact the *ſimple* verb, having no reference to the accident of time. I confeſs my inability to decide the queſtion, and will therefore leave it to the judgment of the reader with one only obſervation; *namely*, that as there is not, in fact, any ſuch thing as preſent time, which is nothing more than a mere fiction of the mind, ſo it follows that any portion of *paſt* and *future* time may be therefore accurately aſſumed as *preſent*. Thus it is that we ſpeak of *the preſent day*, *the preſent hour*, *the preſent week*, *the preſent century*, &c. although

time

time exists only in succession, from which it follows, that the parts of a moment are *past* and *future** with reference to each other, as certainly as those of a year.

RULE ELEVENTH.

THE word است, employed as a component part of the preterperfect tense of a verb, should follow, without the intervention of any other word, the past participle of the verb with which it is compounded: as زید آمده است "ZYDE has come;" زید بکر را کشته است "ZYDE has slain BUKR;" زید توانگر شده است "ZYDE has become rich;" &c. But in poetry, the two component parts of the tense may be separated by the intervention of other words. Example: گشته انگشت تحیر نقل دندان من است for انگشت تحیر نقل دندان من گشته است "The finger of perplexity has become the repast of my teeth," that is to say, "I am continually biting my nails, as a mark of the perplexity under which I suffer."

CONCLUSION.

THE preceding rules are generally applicable to the verbs است and هست in both numbers, and in all persons; and the difference (if any) between these verbs, must be considered as of little importance. I have already stated that هست is generally employed as a PERFECT VERB, and that است is most commonly a mere connective or IMPERFECT VERB, employed to unite the subject and the predicate of a given proposition. The former cannot be combined with the past participle of a Persian verb, in order to form the preterperfect tense, whereas the latter may be so combined. It is proper to remark that there is another verb, namely the word هی so well known to Hindoostanee Grammar, which may be sometimes observed to occur in Persian. This word is said to have belonged origi-

nally

nally to the DUREE dialect; and is recorded accordingly, in every Persian Dictionary. It occurs twice in the following lines of HAFIZ: *first*, as a substantive verb, synonimous with هست; and *secondly*, as a کلمهٔ تنبیه or PARTICLE OF ADMONITION corresponding with "Ho! Have a care!" in English.

ساقی اگرت هوای ما هی   جز باده میار پیش ما هی

"O CUP bearer! if you have any affection for us, bring us, I pray you, nothing but wine."

THE rules that relate to the omission or insertion of the letter الف ا of the word است ا, are purposely omitted in this chapter, because most of them have already been detailed in a note to the first volume, page 76 et seq.

SECTION SECOND.

بودن TO BE; WITH ALL ITS INFLEXIONS.

As a perfect verb, the word بودن signifies EXISTENCE; ولیکن چه سود است کاین کار بود   تاسف ندارد درین کار سود "But what avails it! now that the thing has been, (or existed) repentance is no longer of any use."* As an imperfect verb, it is employed simply as a mark of predication, having a reference to past time in the past tense of the verb; as زید توانگر بود "ZYDE was rich;" بکر نویسنده بود "BUKR was a writer;" &c.

* I am not quite certain that the place of بود may not here be more accurately supplied by the verb شود; (for شد;) ولیکن چه سود است کاین کار شود "But what avails it! now that the thing is past or over;" &c. The copies of the سکندر نامه in my possession read بود, not شود; but I leave the question to be determined by the judgment of the reader.

That

That tense may be compounded with the inflexions of the verb زاستن and will be found, in this case, to indicate the *uninterrupted* existence of a given attribute in the substantive noun to which it is imputed: as زید توانگر بوده است "ZYDE has been (hitherto uninterruptedly) rich;" &c. As an auxiliary, the word بود forms a component part of the pluperfect tense of every Persian verb; (کشته بود ; گفته بود ; رفته بود ; &c.) and as it cannot be accurately compounded with itself, (بوده بود) it is therefore destitute of the pluperfect tense, notwithstanding the ingenuity of Sir WILLIAM JONES, who has supplied the omission by the invention of بوده باشد, a combination, the meaning of which I do not profess to be able to understand. The application of بود to the purposes of speech, admits of no illustration by the rules of Grammar, and I proceed, therefore, to detail the rules that relate to the application of the aorist بود or باشد.

RULE FIRST.

THE Aorist باشد may be combined with the past participle of a Persian verb, for the purpose of forming a tense which has obtained the name of the ماضی مشکوک or DOUBTFUL PRETERITE: as آمده باشد "He *may* have come;" رفته باشد "He *may* have gone;" کشته باشد "He *may* have slain;" &c. But this tense has also a continuative sense; as هر روز نزد من آمده باشد "He will *continue* to visit me daily;" and there is nothing but the context by which to determine the difference between them. In the continuative sense, I conceive باشد to be a PERFECT VERB significant of EXISTENCE: "He will EXIST (or CONTINUE) in the state of having come to visit me every day;" and in the doubtful sense, it is probably an IMPERFECT VERB, employed as a mark of doubtful predication.

RULE SECOND.

The reader is aware that the same rule is applicable to the formation of the *simple passive* and the *past active* participle of all Persian verbs: as کشته "Having slain;" or "The person slain;" دیده, "Having seen;" or "The thing seen;" &c. &c. And hence it happens that the words کشته باشد (and so also of every similar example) admit of a double sense: "He may have slain;" (that is to say, "He may be the person *having* slain such a one;") or "He may be slain;" that is to say, "He himself may be the person slain;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

The aorist باشد may form the link of connexion between a given subject and the following attributive which is imputed to it: as زنگی نادان باشد و رومی زیرک "An Ethiopian will be generally ignorant, and a Grecian will be generally intelligent;" کافر در دنیا خوش باشد و در آخرت ناخوش "An infidel will be happy in this world, and miserable in the other;" &c. It is not to be doubted that the last proposition might be accurately rendered by the verb است: (کافر در دنیا خوش است و در آخرت ناخوش) and I ask, therefore, in what consists the difference of sense between these verbs, or to what propositions they are respectively applicable? It seems to me, that though either may often supply the place of the other, the verb است, employed in its proper sense, indicates the POSITIVE existence of the predicate in a given object or substantive noun; as زید زیرک است "ZYDE *is* intelligent;" &c. And the verb باشد, on the contrary, indicates the POSSIBLE, or the PROBABLE existence of a given attribute in the substantive noun to which it is imputed; as زید زیرک باشد "ZYDE *may be* intelligent;" that is to say, "I know no reason why he should be otherwise;" زنگی سیاه باشد "An Ethiopian *will be* black," or "He *may be* black," or "He *may well be* black,"

considering the necessary effects of the climate under which he is born, &c. If there be any truth in this observation, the verb است is most properly applicable to the statement of FACTS, and the verb بَاشَد to the statement of OPINIONS.

RULE FOURTH.

THE word بَاشَد, as a perfect verb, may be followed by a sentence to which it forms the predicate; and the sentence, in that case, will follow the particle کِه *That*. Examples: بَاشَد کِه زَیْد بِیَایَد "It may be that ZYDE will come;" بَاشَد کِه زِین مِیَانَه یَکی کَارگَر شَوَد "It may be that one of these (arrows of prayer) will hit the mark;" &c. As a perfect verb, the word بَاشَد also often signifies TO BE OR TO REMAIN; in which sense, its inflexions have been detailed in the first volume.

RULE FIFTH.

THE Aorist بُوَد is never employed to form the DOUBTFUL PRETERITE, or that CONTINUATIVE TENSE, to which I have referred in the first and second rules. With this exception, all the rules are indifferently applicable to بُوَد or بَاشَد; but the former is, comparatively speaking, of rare occurrence in the Language. Examples: کَافِر دَرِ ینجَا خُوشْ بُوَد وَدَرْ آنْجَا نَاخُوشْ "An infidel will be happy in this world, and miserable in the other;" بُوَد کِه پَرْتَو نُورِی بِبَام مَا افْتَد "It may be, that a ray of light will be directed to my habitation;" &c.

SECTION THIRD.

شُدَن TO BE; WITH ALL ITS INFLEXIONS.

THE verb شُدَن, as an IMPERFECT VERB, signifies TO BE or TO BECOME; that is to say, it indicates a change in the noun which forms the SUBJECT of a given proposition, either from

from one STATE to another, as in the following example: عصارهٔ نی بقدرتش شهد فایق شده "The juice of the cane, by his almighty power, is converted into sugar;" (has become excellent honey;) or from one ATTRIBUTE to another of an opposite nature: as زید توانگر شد "ZYDE[1] has become rich;" (having previously been poor;) و من فقیر شدم "And I have become poor; (having lost the riches which I previously possessed;) &c.

THE inflexions of this verb are combined with the PASSIVE PARTICIPLE, in order to form the passive voice of every Persian verb of the transitive class: as خط نوشته می شود و نوشته شد و نوشته خواهد شد "The letter is now a writing," or "It has been written;" or "It will be written;" &c. And though certain Grammarians have remarked that the fact is not universally true, because we cannot accurately employ the verb شنیده شدم or شنیده شدی in the first and second persons of the past (or any other) tense of the passive voice, I answer that the reason is obviously this: *namely*, because the nominative to every passive verb must be that noun to which the verb is transitive in the active voice. Now the verb TO HEAR is obviously transitive to words significant of *sound* as سخن *Speech*; &c. and it is merely by the idiom of our language that we are justified in stating that "we have heard the SPEAKER; when in fact we have heard nothing but the WORDS or SOUNDS which he may have had occasion to utter in our presence. The nominative to the passive verb شنیده شد must, therefore, be a word significant of SOUND; (سخن شنیده شد "The SPEECH has been heard;") and the examples من شنیده شدم, تو شنیده شدی, زید شنیده شد, are equally inaccurate; not because the verb شدن is not applicable to the formation of the passive voice of every Persian verb of the transitive class, but because certain verbs, such as شنیدن To HEAR, will not, in the passive voice, receive a nominative which is significant of the name of a RATIONAL BEING. On this subject I refer the reader

to

to CHAPTER SIXTH, PAGE 184, of this VOLUME; and will here venture to expreſs my wonder that ſo plain a principle ſhould have eſcaped the ſagacity of MOLOVEE AMEER HYDER, a man whoſe attention was eminently devoted to the elucidation of the principles of Perſian Grammar.

THE verb شدن is ſometimes compounded with the paſt participle of neuter verbs, which (ſo employed) muſt be conſidered in the light of ſimple adjective nouns: as هر چه بر دست و زبان ملک رفته شود بافواه گفته شود "What-ever is done or ſaid by kings, will be talked of by other men;" but this I believe to be a rare occurrence, notwithſtanding the unexceptionable accuracy of the preceding example (رفته شود) which is ſupported by the authority of the poet JAUMEE.

As a perfect verb, the word شدن may ſupply the place of رفتن TO GO: شد بر محتسب و کار بدستوری کرد "She (the daughter of the grape, a perſonification of wine,) has repaired or gone to the MOOHTŬSIB, (a cenſor whoſe duty it is to ſuperintend the public morals, and more eſpecially to prevent the uſe of wine,) and has acted as uſual;" that is to ſay, "ſhe has gained him over to her own ſide of the queſtion, or has induced him, by the power of her charms, to commit a breach of duty by permitting the public to indulge in the faſcinating pleaſures of wine, which he himſelf had not the reſolution to reſiſt." It may be alſo employed in ſeveral other ſenſes; as مرا خبر شد "News has reached me;" یاران را چه شد "What has happened to my friends;" ز نمازت چه شد ار پشت خم است چون ترا قبلهٔ همت شکم است "What avail your prayers, although your back is bent (in ſeeming adoration,) ſince in fact, you are an abject ſlave to your belly;" &c. I do not perfectly underſtand the principle on which the verb شدن is thus employed, but ſuppoſe it denotes ſome GENERAL IDEA, which muſt be therefore variouſly tranſlated, according to the examples in which it may happen to occur.

گردیدن

گشتن or گردیدن TO BE OR TO BECOME.

THESE verbs are not unfrequently combined with the passive participle, for the purpose of forming the passive voice of certain Persian verbs: as کشته گشت or کشته گردید for کشته شد "He was slain;" &c. And in this case, they are exactly synonimous with the verb شدن; but the latter may be combined with all Persian verbs of the transitive class without any exception, whereas, in the case of گشتن or گردیدن, the accuracy of the combination seems to depend on the authority of prescription. I should not hesitate to use the phrase زده شد, whether supported by authority or not; but I would refrain from the use of زده گشت or زده گردید unless, (which I do not believe,) it can be supported by sufficient authority.

THE words گشتن or گردیدن, like the verb شدن, indicate a change in the noun which forms the subject of a given proposition, either from one state to another; as قطرهٔ آب در گردید "The drop of water became a pearl;" or from one attribute to another of an opposite nature; as زید توانگر گشت or زید توانگر گردید "ZYDE became rich;" &c. In this sense, either verb may, I suppose, be applied by analogy to any given proposition, whether supported by the authority of prescription or not.

As perfect verbs they may supply the place of سیر کردن To TRAVEL; as در اقصای عالم بگشتم بسی "I have travelled much in the world;" دیروز در باغ می گردیدم "I was walking yesterday in the Garden;" &c. Or of متغیر شدن TO SUFFER CHANGE as که حالش بگردید و رنگش بریخت "His state was changed, and the color fled from his cheeks;" &c.

آید آمد

THESE two words are ſometimes (though rarely) compounded with the paſſive participle, in order to form the paſſive voice of certain Perſian verbs: as سخن درست گفته آمد "A juſt obſervation has been uttered;" می‌شاید که کار نیک کرده آید "It is proper that good actions ſhould be performed;" &c. They are never ſo employed but in the third perſon ſingular, and then by the authority of preſcription alone.

CONCLUSION.

FROM the contents of the ſecond and third ſections of this chapter, it muſt be obvious to the reader, that the ſenſe of the verb بودن is by no means to be confounded with that of شدن TO BE. There are, perhaps, certain examples in which the one may ſupply the place of the other, ſuch as ولیکن چه سود است کاین کار بود تاسف ندارد دوزین کار سود "But what avails it! Now that the thing has once been, (or exiſted,) regret, in this caſe, is of no uſe;" &c. I have already ſtated that the word بود might be here advantageouſly exchanged for شود, the ancient form of شد; (ولیکن چه سود است کاین کار شود الی آخره "But what avails it! now that the thing is FINISHED or OVER;" &c.) and many are of opinion that the Poet (NEZAUMEE) muſt have written شود, inſtead of بود which they conſider to be here erroneous. The two copies of the سکندرنامه now in my poſſeſſion, have بود not شود; but I have no dependence on the accuracy of either, and can therefore ſcarcely venture to offer an opinion. I do not believe that بود is an error, although I have little doubt that شود (or شد) is more commonly uſed than بود in all the examples of this claſs. The words زید درویش بود اکنون توانگر شد "ZYDE was poor, but

now

now he is rich;" furnifh a very good example of the difference of fenfe between بود and شد; fince it would be abfolute non-fenfe to fay زید درویش شد اکنون توانگر بود, except in the following fenfe; *namely*, that " ZYDE has become poor, whereas he was rich but now," that is to fay, a fhort time ago.

As the verb شد is often lengthened by the Poets into شود, fo is the verb بود often contracted into بد through all its inflexions: (بدم ، بدی ، بد ، بدیم ، بدید ، بدند) as in the following example, in which FIRDOUSEE has ventured to anticipate the judgment of pofterity on the merits of his genius.

چو فردوسی اندر زمانه نبود   بد آن بد که بختش جوانه نبود

" TIME has never produced a genius equal to that of FIRDOUSEE, unfortunate only in this, that the fates were not propitious to him!"

SECTION FOURTH.

خواستن TO WISH.

THERE is little to be obferved on the application of this word to the purpofes of fpeech. As an AUXILIARY, it is combined with the infinitive, or the *Hafilé Mufder*, (by rejecting the letter نون of the infinitive) for the purpofe of forming the future tenfe of all Perfian verbs without exception; as خواهم کرد (rarely خواهم کردن) " I will do;" خواهم رفت (rarely خواهم رفتن) " I will go;" &c. In poetry, the two component parts of the tenfe are fometimes reverfed in the order of fpeech: as " When چو رخت از مملکت بر بست خواهی (خواهی بر بست) you are about to take your departure from a country; &c. and they

are

are ſometimes ſeparated by the intervention of other words: as خواهد آخر بر سر آورد for آخر بر سر خواهد آورد ; and other combinations of the ſame nature.

The ſecond component part of the tenſe ſeems to be the ACCUSATIVE or OBJECT of the firſt; ſince there is little or no difference in point of ſenſe between the words زید خواهد آمد ; and زید آمدن خود را می خواهد ; زید بکر را خواهد کشت and زید کشتن بکر را خواهان است ; &c. The verb خواستن may govern a ſentence following the particle که *That*; as می خواهم که بروم ; خواستم که بروم ; &c. &c.

تَوانِستَن To be able.

The application of this verb correſponds exactly with that of خواستن : as توانم رفت ; or توانستم رفت ; or توانم که تیغ زبان برکشم ; &c. and it may be employed as an impersonal verb (توان) deprived of the terminations that indicate perſon: as in the following lines of a poet whoſe name I do not at preſent remember.

اسلام ز اطراف فرنگ آوردن
آیینهٔ چین ز ملک زنگ آوردن
از بادهٔ رخ شیخ برنگ آوردن
بتوان نتوان ترا بچنگ آوردن

"To find in Europe the Moohummudan faith: to find in Ethiopia the mirrors of China: to inflame with wine the cheeks of the Shykh: (here ſignificant of a pure devotee, who cannot be induced to taſte of wine) all this may be done, but it is impoſſible to obtain the poſſeſſion of thee."

آرستن

آرستن To be able.

This verb indiſpenſibly requires a negative particle, being never uſed in an affirmative ſenſe; and its application is chiefly reſtricted to poetry, although it is ſometimes, (perhaps not unfrequently,) found to occur in proſe. Example: بگفت نیارم شد این جا مقیم "He ſaid I cannot remain here;" &c. In other reſpects, it is ſynonimous with the verb توانستن To be able, from which its application in the Language cannot be diſtinguiſhed: as نیارست آمد ؛ نیارست آمدن ؛ نیارد که بیاید ؛ &c. It cannot be uſed as an impersonal verb; like the word توان, and its application is comparatively of rare occurrence in the Language.

باید It is necessary.

شاید It is proper.

The verb شاید (and perhaps باید alſo) appears to have admitted, formerly, the inflexions of perſon, as in the following lines of Nezaumee:

خواجگی مرا تو می شائی بندگی ترا منم شایان

"You are the proper maſter for me, and I am worthy of being a ſervant to you."

But both verbs are now generally impersonal in the paſt and preſent tenſes: as ترا شاید رفت ؛ مرا باید رفت ؛ باید که بروم ؛ شاید که بروم ؛ بایستی که می رفتم ؛ مرا رفتن باید ؛ شایستی که می رفتم ؛ &c. And they are both defective in the future tenſe. The adjectives شایسته and بایسته are ſynonimous with شایان already adduced: as امر بایسته ؛

کار

نگارش یافته; and other examples of the same nature. The verb شاید is not unfrequently translated by the word PERHAPS: as شاید که برود "Perhaps he may go:" and though each verb is distinguished from the other by sense, yet either, in the common practise of the Persian Language, may be often observed to supply the place of both. They are sometimes employed in various senses; as نباید که چون صبح گردد سپید "Let it not be, that when the morning dawns;" &c. the nature of which must be determined by the context, since they might otherwise admit of the common literal translation.

EITHER verb, having been expressed in one sentence, may be accurately omitted in another with which it is connected by the intervention of a copulative conjunction; as in the following example from ABOOL FUZL, in which the words ودیگران را باعث شد are obviously employed for ودیگران را باعث باید شد; and such omissions are of common occurrence in the Language.

اوّل در تهذیب اخلاق خود باید کوشید آنگاه ودیگران را باعث شد

"IT is necessary, in the first place, to correct your own morals; and *afterwards*, to become the cause of amendment in others."

CONCLUSION.

IT seems to me that all the preceding verbs are naturally PERFECT; having assumed the character of IMPERFECT VERBS, merely by the operation of that principle which I have already described under the term تجرید. The influence of تجرید is, indeed, frequently and optionally extended to a considerable number of Persian verbs, besides those already mentioned; such as

آمدن

آمدن ; افتادن ; نمودن : &c. insomuch, that it would be hazardous to limit the number of IMPERFECT VERBS in this, or perhaps in any other Language. To explain by examples.

THE word افتادن, as a perfect verb, signifies TO FALL; but it becomes IMPERFECT in the following example: الحمد لله که همه مساعی سود مند افتاد، "Praised be GOD! all our labours have proved efficacious:" and so, indeed, does the verb PROVED, by which it is translated into the English Language. So, also, if I affirm that "JAMES fell sick;" the word FELL is an imperfect verb; because I mean to say, not that he *fell;* but merely that he was seized with a fit of sickness; or in other words, I mean to employ the verb FELL as a mere CONNECTIVE, deprived of the attributive character which is essential to its nature as a perfect verb. And on the other hand, if I affirm that "JAMES DIED poor," the verb DIED is here PERFECT, because I intend, in this case, to ascribe the sense of the infinitive (namely DEATH) to a given object or substantive noun. Let the word POOR be taken away, and it will still be true that "JAMES DIED;" but if, from the preceding examples, the predicate of the proposition shall be taken away, the sense of each will be altered or lost.

THIS I conceive to be the true test by which a PERFECT VERB may be always distinguished, even from itself, when employed as an IMPERFECT VERB to unite the subject and the predicate of a given proposition. For I have already said, in speaking of the example "He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," that it is not BEING or EXISTENCE, but SAMENESS or UNITY, or the possession of a nature unsusceptible of change, which is here doubtless ascribed to the DEITY; and so also, I conceive, that it is not FALLING but merely SICKNESS that we mean to ascribe to a given individual, when we affirm of him, that "He fell sick or ill." Yet we are at liberty to affirm of the DEITY that "he IS or EXISTS the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever;" in which

case,

caſe, the word IS becomes, immediately, a perfect verb. And we are alſo at liberty (for any thing I know to the contrary) to affirm of an individual that "He FELL ſick;" or, in other words, that "He, being ſick, fell or took to his bed;" &c. in which caſe FELL, alſo, becomes a perfect verb. The difference between them is therefore ſlight; and ſuch as the mind will not recognize, otherwiſe than by adverting minutely to its own operations. It conſiſts apparently in this; that every IMPERFECT VERB forms a connective, or middle term, or mark of predication, employed to unite the ſubject and the predicate of a given propoſition; whereas A PERFECT VERB is itſelf the predicate; and has, beſides, the force of a connective, or middle term, or mark of predication.

CHAPTER THIRD.

افعال تامه OR PERFECT VERBS.

A PERFECT verb has already been defined to be a word which indicates the union of its own infinitive with a given object or ſubſtantive noun, in ſuch a manner as to form a perfect ſentence, whether conveying an aſſertion or not: as "JAMES ſleepeth," or "Does he ſleep?" "JOHN readeth," or "Does he read?" &c.

PERFECT verbs are TRANSITIVE or NEUTER; (لازم و متعدی) ACTIVE or PASSIVE; (معروف و مجهول) &c. and all verbs are inflected into the PAST, PRESENT and FUTURE TENSES, by means of which they indicate the occurrence of a given event in paſt, preſent, or future time. If therefore we have occaſion to ſpeak of a paſt (and ſo alſo of a preſent or future event,) we ſhall natually employ the paſt tenſe of the verb: ("JAMES died yeſterday;"

yesterday;" "JAMES dined two hours ago;" &c.) and this is done on so plain a principle, as to admit of no illustration by the rules of grammar.

BUT the idiom of the Persian language authorises, in certain cases, the substitution of one tense for another; and so considered, the application of TENSES will be admitted to form a reasonable object of Grammatical research. My enquiries on the subject have, however, been less fruitful of useful information than at first I had reason to believe they would be; but they have not therefore been wholly unsuccessful, and I have thought it right to insert them here, in the belief that the partial disappointment of my expectations has been chiefly occasioned by the sterility of the subject, which is more promising in appearance than it will be found in reality, by those, who, like myself, may have occasion, hereafter, to investigate the truth.

APPLICATION OF TENSES.

SECTION FIRST.

ماضی OR SIMPLE PRETERITE.

RULE FIRST.

THE PAST TENSE may be optionally, and is, in fact, not unfrequently employed to supply the place of the AORIST, in a given sentence comprising a شرط or CONDITIONAL MEMBER, and the جزا or CONSEQUENCE flowing from the شرط. In this case, the past tense may accurately occur in both, or in either member of the sentence. Examples: اگر نرسیدی (اگر نرسی) انتظارت خواهد کشت "If you do not arrive (by such a time) the languor of expectation will kill me;" اگر امروز بر خلق رحم کنی فردا مرحوم شدی (مرحوم خواهی شد) "If you are merciful to others to-day, yourself will be

received into mercy to morrow ;" اگر رفتی بردی و اگر خفتی مردی

" If you go on, you are safe; but if you sleep, you die." So, also, in the following lines of NEZAUMEE:

به هشتاد و نود چون در رسیدی بسا سختی که از دوران کشیدی

" If you attain the age of eighty or ninety, many are the woes that will fall to your lot."

THESE lines, as they stand in Persian, might be addressed to a youth of sixteen, with as much propriety as to an old man of ninety; from which it follows plainly, that the past is here used for the future tense of the verb.

RULE SECOND.

THE past may supercede the future tense of a verb in both members, or in either member of a sentence comprising a relative pronoun. Examples:

هر که علم شد بسخا و کرم بند نشاید که نهد بر درم (علم شود)

" He who would obtain celebrity for his bounty, must not put his money under lock and key." هر که در خوردیش ادب نکند در بزرگی صلاح ازو برخاست (برخیزد) "He who is untaught or vicious in his youth, is not likely to be a virtuous man." هر که با پولاد بازو پنجه کرد (پنجه کند) ساعد مسکین خود را رنجه کرد (رنجه کند)

" He who wrestles with a man stronger than himself must go to the wall;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

THE past may supercede the future tense of the verb in the statement of a permanent proposition, believed by the speaker to be of certain occurrence. Thus an immolated victim of tyranny, is supposed by SAADEE to speak of his murderer in the following terms: دمی بیش بر من سیاست نراند

عقوبت برو تا قیامت بماند (یعنی مانده است و خواهد ماند)

" His punishment of me was over in a moment, but the evil

consequences

consequences of guilt will for ever continue to pursue him."

RULE FOURTH.

THE past is often found to supercede the future tense of a verb in stating the consequence of obedience to a command expressed by means of a verb in the imperative mode. In this case, the consequence is commonly stated for the purpose of inciting immediate obedience, and the verb is put into the past tense, in order to indicate the rapidity or certainty with which the effect will flow from the cause. Examples:

بخور و به بخش که دنیا و آخرت بردی (خواهی برد) "Enjoy the goods of fortune, and contribute to relieve the wants of others, for in that case, your reward is happiness here and hereafter."

تو ز آن جا آمدی این جا دویدی
از این جا در گذر کانجا رسیدی (خواهی رسید)

"Thence have you come (namely, from the world of spirits,) and here (to this world) you have directed your flight; shake off the propensities of mortal flesh, and there (which is your home) you will arrive once more." &c.*

THE

---

* The words این جا and آن جا, in the mouth of a SOOFEE poet, must be generally translated by this world and the next; or by this world and the world of spirits; yet there is nothing to prevent a true Soofee from aspiring to the bliss of the next world even before he has "shuffled off this mortal coil."

The celebrated MOOLLÁ JŬLAUL has expressed this sentiment in the clearest language; affirming in so many words, that it is a matter of little importance whether a true SOOFEE shall be living or dead; since the use of his corporal faculties will not prevent (though it must impede in a certain degree) his enjoyment of the beatific vision, from which he will reap *in this world* the same bliss which others expect in the *next*.

The passage in question contains a clear, though concise view of the nature of the arguments employed by the SOOFEES; and as a matter of curiosity, the reader may not be displeased with its insertion here.

ارسطاطالیس از ارفلیطس نقل می کند که چیز های مختلف را با هم دیگر التیام و تألّف تام نتواند بود فاما چیز های متشاکل بهم دیگر مشتاق باشند و در شرح این ایشان

RULE FIFTH.

The past may supercede the future tense of a verb in stating a proposition, the object of which is to deny the importance of a given action, considered with reference to its performance.

گفته اند که چون جواهرِ بسیطه متشاکل باشند و بیکدیگر مشتاق هر اینه میانِ ایشان
تالیفی روحانی و اتّحادی معنوی حاصل شود و تباین مرتفع گردد چه تباین از لوازمِ
مادیات است و در مادیات این نوع تالّف نتواند و تلاقیِ ایشان بذوات
و حقائق متصوّر نباشد بل که بنهایات و سطوح تواند بود و این تلاقی بدرجهٔ آن
اتّصال نرسد و چون جوهرِ بسیط که نفسِ انسانی است از کدوراتِ جسمانی
پاک گردد و محبتِ لذّاتِ طبیعی ازو محو شود بحکم مناسبت بعالمِ قدس منجذب
شود و بنظرِ بصیرت مشاهدهٔ جمالِ حقیقی نماید و پروانه صفت هستیِ خود را در انوارِ
قاهرهٔ تجلّیاتِ الهی محو گرداند و بمقامِ وحدت که نهایتِ مقامات است برسد
و این مرتبهٔ حقّ الیقین است و صاحبِ آن مرتبه را تعلّق ببدن و تجرّد از آن زیاده
فرقی نباشد چه استعمالِ قوای بدنی او را از نظر بجمالِ حقیقی بازندارد و سعادتی
که دیگران را در نشأهٔ اخروی مترقّب است این را درین نشأ حاصل باشد

امروز در آن کوشش که بینا باشی　　حیرانِ جمالِ آن دل آرا باشی
شرمت بادا چو کودکان در شبِ عید　　تا چند بانتظارِ فردا باشی

لیکن بعد از مفارقتِ کلّی لذّتِ او اصفی باشد چه هرچند درین نشا نورِ بصیرت

از

mance or otherwise. Example: آمدی یا نیامدی هر دو برابر است "It is a matter of no importance whether you come or not;" or in the Aorist: بیائی چه و نیائی چه "What does it signify whether you come or not?" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

The past is generally preferred to the future tense of the verb, in stating the purport of an order which has been obeyed; and in this case, the phrase significant of the thing ordered, most commonly follows the verb فرمود or گفت; &c. Examples: ملک فرمود تا استاد را خلعت و نعمت دادند "The King gave orders to reward the master with an honorary robe and other marks of his favor, and these orders were obeyed accordingly;" or more literally, "The

---

از دقائق اسما و صفات مشاهدهٔ وحدت ذات نماید فاما خالی از شوب ثنویت
که مقتضای نشا تعلق است نتواند بود و شهود تام بی دغدغهٔ مزاحمت رقیبان
جز در خلوت خانهٔ تجرد میسر نگردد و بنابرین همیشه منتظر و مترصد رفع این حجاب
و کشف این نقاب بوده بزبان حال بفحوای این مقال مترنم دارد

حجاب چهرهٔ جان می شود غبار تنم   خوشا دمی که ازان چهره پرده برفکنم
چنین قفس نه سزای من خوش الحان ست   روم بگلشن رضوان که مرغ آن چمنم

و این محبت نهایت مراتب عشق است و کمال مطلق و ذروهٔ مقامات
واصلان و غایت مراتب کاملان است .

عشق است هرچه هست بگفتیم و گفته اند
عشقت بوصل دوست رساند بقرب راست

 King

King issued orders, and so they *bestowed* on the master an honorary robe." We are thus at once informed, that the orders were issued, and also obeyed; whereas the use of the Aorist (ملک فرمود تا استادرا خلعت و نعمت دهند) would leave it doubtful whether the king's orders were obeyed or not. So, also, فراش باد صبارا گفته تا فرش زمردین بگسترد "He (the DEITY) issued his command to the morning breeze, which *spread* accordingly the verdant carpet of the earth;" و دایهٔ ابر بهاری را فرموده تا بنات نبات را در مهد زمین بپرورد "And sent forth his mandates to the nurse of the vernal clouds, which (nurse) *cherished* accordingly, the infant herbs of the spring in the cradle of the earth;" &c. The use of the Aorist, though certainly optional, would be much less elegant than that of the preterite in all these examples.

RULE SEVENTH.

GENERAL opinions ought to result from the observation of facts; and whether we state a general opinion, or the facts on which an opinion is founded, the effect is the same in either case. An Englishman will commonly state the opinion, as "Force cannot cope with fortune;" and a Persian will be often disposed to state the facts on which the opinion is founded; as "The strong have been generally foiled in the contest with fortune;" &c. This, therefore, is a case in which the past may be said to supercede the future tense of the verb. Example:

گزین پس بکنجی نشینم چو مور که روزی نخوردند پیلان بزور

"Henceforward I shall retire and dwell in a corner, like the ant; for even the elephant (which is the strongest of all animals) cannot master (has not mastered) his fortune by force."

RULE EIGHTH.

THE prophetic denunciation of a future event will be often expressed in the past tense, in order to indicate the certainty of

its

its occurrence. Example: کافر امروز اگرچه خوش است لیکن فردا است که طوق لعنت برگردن کشیده و بانواع عذاب گرفتار گردیده. "The infidel, however happy to-day, will be encircled to-morrow by a collar of curses, and will suffer miseries of every description."

RULE NINTH.

If, by the effect of a relative pronoun or otherwise, the past tense of a given verb shall assume the sense of the future tense; then every other verb in the past tense, which is connected with it by means of conjunctions, &c. will also assume a future sense. Examples: هر که آمد عمارتی نو ساخت "Whoever enters into this world, builds for himself a new habitation;" رفت و منزل بدیگری پرداخت "which he quits (at his death) and leaves to another;" وان دگر پخت همچنان هوسی "His successor is guilty of the same folly;" وین عمارت بسر نبرد کسی "But nobody continues permanently to enjoy the habitation." &c.

CONCLUSION.

It seems to me that most of the preceding rules have their basis in the following principle, to which I have already had occasion to advert; namely, that the occurrence of a future event is naturally a matter of great uncertainty, and generally speaking, will be so considered if expressed by the future tense of the verb. Past events having already occurred, are subject to no uncertainty at all:

> "Not heaven itself upon the past has power,
> "What has been has been! and I have had my hour."

And hence it happens, that a Persian, having occasion to speak of a future event which he believes to be of certain occurrence,

rence, will naturally enough employ the paſt tenſe of the verb; by the uſe of which he means to appriſe his auditor that "the occurrence of the event, though ſtill future, is in his opinion not leſs certain than if it were paſt."

SECTION SECOND.

ماضی استمراری OR THE CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE.

The principles that regulate the application of this tenſe to the purpoſes of ſpeech are of a nature ſo difficult, that they have baffled all my endeavours to place the ſubject in a clear point of view. I ſhall therefore furniſh the reader with ſuch imperfect lights as I myſelf have been able to obtain; truſting that the reſult of his own reflexions may enable him to ſupply whatever is wanting to the more perfect elucidation of this intricate ſubject.

The continuative preterite is formed from the ſimple paſt tenſe of the verb by prefixing the particles می or همی; as می کردم or همی کردم; می رفتم or همی رفتم; &c. It may be alſo formed in the firſt and third perſons ſingular, and in the third perſon plural, by adding to the ſimple preterite the letter یای مجهول; as کردمی; کردی; کردندی; &c. The following are all the rules that I have been able to collect, regarding its uſe and application to the purpoſes of ſpeech.

RULE FIRST.

It denotes the continued operation of the ſenſe of a given verb during ſome definite or indefinite period of paſt time, and is therefore termed the continuative preterite. Examples: آن را نگاه میداشتم "I continued to preſerve it;" بملاقات فلان میرفتم "I was in the habit of viſiting ſuch a

perſon

perſon (every now and then);" &c. The reader will obſerve that there is an obvious difference in the ſenſe of the term استمرار, or CONTINUATION, as applicable to each of the preceding examples. The action of the verb "To preſerve," is continued without interruption of any kind; whereas that of the verb "To viſit," is continued by its repetition at certain intervals. It may be inferred, therefore, that the nature of the continuative ſenſe will vary with that of the action to which it is imputed.

RULE SECOND.

IT indicates the ſtate of its own agent, at ſome ſpecific period of paſt time, either expreſſed or left undefined. Examples: دوش چون طاوس می نازیدم اندر باغ وصل "I was ſtrutting laſt night like the peacock, in the garden of union" (with my beloved miſtreſs;) در مجلس او کتاب شاه نامه می خواندند "They were reading the SHAHNAMA in his preſence," (that is to ſay, on a certain ſpecific occaſion;) &c.

RULE THIRD.

IT forms a ſort of OPTATIVE mode of the verb; being generally employed to indicate the wiſhes of the ſpeaker, with reference to ſome definite or indefinite period of paſt time. Example: کاشکی که زید زنده بودی "Would that ZYDE had been alive;" or "Would that ZYDE were now alive;" (which is no longer poſſible;) چه بودی اگر دل آن ماه مهربان بودی "How delightful! if the heart of that beautiful woman had been fovorable; or were now favorable to me;" (an event which may poſſibly ſtill occur.) In every example of this kind, there is properly ſpeaking a reference to paſt time; yet this tenſe of the verb, when ſo uſed, will coaleſce with the word اکنون *Now*, ſignificant of preſent time; (as کاشکی که زید اکنون زنده بودی "Would that

that

that Zyde were now alive,") on a principle which I do not perfectly understand. I shall furnish one more example, with a view to excite the readers attention to the optative application of this singular tense.

کاش کان روز که در پای تو شد خار اجل

دست گیتی بزدی تیغ هلاکم بر سر

تا درین روز جهان بی تو ندیدی چشمم

این منم بر سر خاک تو که خاکم بر سر

سعدی

"O that fortune *had* unsheathed against me the sword of destruction, on the day when your foot was pierced by the thorn of death! For then *would* my eyes have been spared the pain of beholding the world deprived of thy presence: Alas! on thy grave I stand, heaping on my head the dust of lamentation and grief."

RULE FOURTH.

This tense will be almost invariably employed to indicate past time, in both members of a sentence comprising a شرط or conditional member; and the جزا or consequence flowing from the شرط. As when we say in English "If James had been virtuous, he would have abstained from the commission of such and such crimes;" or to express the same sentiment in other words, "He was *not* virtuous, and therefore *committed* the crimes in question." In this point of view, each verb, in its negative form, may be said to possess an affirmative sense; and vice versa. Examples:

اگر هزار جان می داشتم در پای جانان فدا می کردم

"Had

" Had I poſſeſſed (or did I poſſeſs) a thouſand lives, I would have ſacrificed (or would ſacrifice) them all for my beloved."

ترا اگر نه میدیدم چنین واله نمی شدم " Had I not ſeen you, I ſhould have been (or ſhould be) leſs deeply in love than now I am." مرا صبری اگر بودی نگشتی کار من مشکل " Had I poſſeſſed (or did I poſſeſs) patience, I ſhould have been (or ſhould be) leſs miſerable than now I am."

خیال اگر نشدی سد آب دیدهٔ من
هزار چشمه به هر گوشه روان بودی

" Had not the image of my beloved (which fills my eye), ſerved (or did it not ſerve) as a mound to reſtrain my tears, they would have guſhed out (or would guſh out) into a thouſand fountains (rapidly) flowing in every direction."

It is to be obſerved however, that the uſe of this tenſe in the جزا, or ſecond member of the ſentence, may be ſometimes elegantly ſuperceded by the pluperfect: as in the following example from the Anwaaré Soohylee.

اگر لحظهٔ در محافظت تو اهمال نمودمی این جانور مشفق و دوست مهربان تو شبستان از خون تو مالامال ساخته بود (یعنی می ساخت)

" Had I delayed for an inſtant to provide for your ſafety, this kind and friendly animal *had ſtained* (would have ſtained) the bed-chamber with your blood."

The uſe of the pluperfect tenſe ساخته بود, ſeems here to denote that the event ſtated, namely, the ſhedding of the blood of the party addreſſed, would have been *finiſhed* or *over* before

fore the time of ſpeaking; a circumſtance which would be left uncertain, if we employ inſtead of it the tenſe بني ساخت.

CONCLUSION.

I THINK it neceſſary to mark, by a few obſervations, the importance of the fourth and laſt rule for the application of the CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE. By that rule, we are informed that the continuative preterite muſt be generally employed in both members of a conditional ſentence, having a reference to paſt time; and though the rule is open to certain exceptions, as in the example drawn from the ANWAURE SOOHYLEE, it may be truly affirmed that thoſe exceptions are of rare occurrence, and that the governing principle is the ſame in them all. The ſimple preterite or the pluperfect are probably the only tenſes by which, in ſuch caſes, the continuative preterite can be ſuperceded; and that only in the جزا or ſecond member of the ſentence, as in the example already adduced.

IT has been ſtated however in the fourth rule, that each verb, in its negative form, may be ſaid to poſſeſs an affirmative ſenſe; and vice-verſâ; as when we affirm of an individual that "If he had done his duty, the miſchief in queſtion might have been avoided;" an aſſertion obviouſly equivalent to the ſtatement of an opinion, that "He has *not* done his duty, and that therefore the miſchief has *not* been avoided." This is moſt probably the true teſt by which to regulate the application of the continuative preterite; for if the ſentence cannot be ſo tranſpoſed, the continuative preterite will not be employed. To explain by an example.

WE may affirm of an individual that "If he committed the crime laid to his charge, he merited (or did merit) the puniſhment by which it may have been followed," a ſentiment by no means equivalent to the ſtatement of an opinion that "He did *not* commit the crime laid to his charge, and therefore

did

did *not* merit the punishment by which it was followed." On the contrary, no opinion is here passed with regard to the guilt or innocence of the accused party; we merely affirm, that the crime, if committed, was such in its own nature, as to merit the punishment inflicted on him; but as to the guilt or innocence of the sufferer, that is a question on which, in the absence of evidence, we do not presume to offer an opinion.

In this case, the continuative preterite will not be employed; and the verb, in the first member of the sentence, must be put into the doubtful, or simple, or compound preterite, as the nature of the case may happen to require. Examples: اگر گناه از وست او صادر شد و صادر شده و صادر شده است و صادر شده باشد. "If the crime has been committed by him", or "Should the crime have been committed by him;" سزاوار قتل است or سزاوار قتل باشد "He is worthy, or must be worthy of the punishment of death;" &c. It is remarkable that the words سزاوار قتل بود "He *was* worthy of Death," would be here inaccurate, I know not precisely for what reason, connected with the sense of اگر *If*. If we substitute for اگر, the words در صورتی که گناه از وست او صادر شد "Supposing the crime was committed by him;" سزاوار قتل بود "He *was* worthy of Death;" the word بود will then be accurate, and may be employed as occasion requires. I now proceed to consider the use and application of the Aorist to the purposes of speech.

SECTION THIRD.

مضارع or Aorist.

The Aorist is defined to be that tense of a verb which is com-

 mon

mon to FUTURE and PRESENT time; being neverthelefs fufceptible of reftriction to either, by means of what is termed a قرينه, either verbal or flowing from the fenfe. Thus the word مي, prefixed to the Aorift, will commonly indicate PRESENT TIME; as مي ميرم; مي روم; مي گريم; &c. and this therefore is a قرينهٔ لفظي or VERBAL KŬREENA, not a KŬREENA flowing from the fenfe.

BUT in the abfence of مي, or any other verbal قرينه, prefent time may yet be often inferred from the context; as هماي بر همه مرغان ازان شرف دارد (for مي دارد) "The Hooma is therefore fuperior to all other Birds;" &c. And this inference, to which we are led by the fenfe of the fentence, is commonly termed a قرينهٔ معنوي, that is to fay, "a Kŭreena flowing from the fenfe." The term قرينه, in its utmoft latitude, is confequently applicable to any kind of inference, either verbally expreffed or gathered from the context; and this term, which cannot be eafily tranflated into Englifh, is of common occurrence in the books of Arabic and Perfian Grammar.

THE term مضارع literally fignifies "SIMILAR," and is applied to the Aorift, becaufe that tenfe of a verb is generally fuppofed to refemble a noun. For a generic noun naturally applicable to many objects, may be fo reftricted, either by means of an Article or otherwife, as to indicate the name of an individual object; and the Aorift, alfo, may be fo reftricted by means of a verbal قرينه or otherwife, as to denote *one* only of thofe times (namely, prefent and future time,) to *both* of which it was originally applicable.

IN

In the abſence of any verbal قرینه, the Perſian Aorist moſt commonly indicates future time; and is generally reſtricted to preſent time by means of the particles می and همی; as می بینم و می جویم، می چینم و می ریزم "I ſee, and yet ſearch: I ſelect, and yet reject;" &c. But preſent time, in the ſtrict and proper ſenſe of the term, is known to be a mere fiction of the mind; firſt, becauſe all time exiſts in ſucceſſion; and ſecondly, becauſe the parts of a moment are conſequently paſt and future with reference to each other, as certainly as thoſe of a year. Any portion of paſt and future time may nevertheleſs be aſſumed as preſent; as when we ſpeak of "the preſent day;" "the preſent week;" "the preſent century;" &c. and hence it happens that preſent time, according to the Grammatical acceptation of the term, commonly indicates that extended portion of time which is coeval with the action of a given verb.

It is the object of the following rules to illuſtrate the application of the Aoriſt, whether reſtricted or not by the particles می or همی; that is to ſay, whether it ſhall form the Aorist properly ſo called, or what has been termed the حال or present tense of the verb.

RULE FIRST.

The Aorist, reſtricted by the particles می or همی, is commonly employed to indicate preſent time: as

همی خندم از لطف یزدان پاک
که مظلوم رفتم نه ظالم بخاک

"I ſmile and rejoice in the favor of God, who has permitted me to die the victim, not the agent of tyranny." And like the preſent tenſe in every other Language, it may, in this caſe, be employed in the ſtatement of thoſe propoſitions which are conſidered

considered by the mind as generally true, whether they are presently true or not. Example: برهمه عالم همی تابد سهیل "The star CANOPUS shines on all the world;" &c. The Aorist, unrestricted by the particles مي or همي, is also employed (though less frequently) in the statement of such propositions. Example:

باران که در لطافت طبعش خلاف نیست
در باغ لاله روید و در شوره بوم خس

"The kindly rains impartially moisten every soil, yet the garden alone produces flowers, (در باغ لاله می روید) and weeds spring up in barren land."

RULE SECOND.

In the conversation of the Persians, though seldom perhaps in written composition, the present is often found to supercede the past tense of the verb, in the statement of those propositions which, though past in point of fact, are recalled by the memory as if they were present. Example:

دی شب گذرم نزد دوستی افتاد و در آنجا عجب بزمی می بینم
و طرفه تماشائی می کنم

"Last night I went to the house of a friend, and there saw (see) a delightful assembly, and enjoyed (enjoy) a most pleasing spectacle;" &c. Of this nature are the Examples: مصنف چنین گوید "The writer thus observes;" پیغمبر چنان خبر می دهد "The prophet informs (or has informed) us;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

The present is often found to supercede the future tense of a verb, in the prophetic statement of a given proposition, which, though future, is nevertheless deemed to be of certain occurrence. Example:

نقد و جنس که بسالها اندوخته است در دو سه روز بتاراج حوادث می رود (خواهد رفت)

"The money and property which he has accumulated in the courſe of many years, will be ſoon ſnatched away by the hand of misfortune."

RULE FOURTH.

THE PRESENT is often found to ſupercede the FUTURE tenſe of a verb in the ſtatement of two propoſitions, connected together by means of the particle یا *Or*. Example:

یا می ستانم از تو خط بنده پروری یا خط بندگی ترا پاره می کنم (پاره خواهم کرد)

"I ſhall either obtain from you an order to reward my ſervices, or I will tear in pieces the lines of my devotion to you."

RULE FIFTH.

THE PRESENT is often found to ſupercede the FUTURE tenſe of the verb in both members, or in either member of a CONDITIONAL SENTENCE, compriſing a شرط and a جزا. Examples:

گر مرا چو خاک زمین خوار می کنی سهل است "If you treat (or ſhall treat) me with ignominy like the duſt of the earth, I can bear it with eaſe."

خبیث را چو تعهد کنی و بنوازی بدولت تو گنه می کند بانبازی

"When you confer favors on the vicious man, he looks only to participate in your wealth."

گر ببینم رخش می میرم از شادی وصل

"If I ſee her face, I die with joy of her preſence;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

THE PRESENT is often found to ſupercede the FUTURE tenſe of the verb in what is termed مقام توقیت; that is to ſay, a

ſentence conſiſting of two members governed by the words *When* or *While*; &c. Example:

وقتی مدعای تو از من حاصل میگردد که مدعای من از تو نیز حاصل گردد

" Then only you *will* obtain your deſire from me, *when* I ſhall obtain my deſire from you;" &c. And in the caſe of a Relative Pronoun: as کانکه جنگ آرد بخون خویش بازی میکند

" For he who fights (ſhall fight,) ſports (or will ſport) with his own life."

RULE SEVENTH.

THE uſe of one verb in the PRESENT tenſe will often furniſh a قرینه, by which another verb in the AORIST will be reſtricted to preſent time; and in this caſe either verb may take precedence of the other in the order of ſpeech. Examples:

تو خلق را چرا پریشان میکنی ظاهرا پادشاهی نداری (نمیداری)

" Why do you treat mankind with tyranny? apparently you have no deſire to reign." یکی را بدست افگند کوه گنج (می افگند)

" He loads ſome with mountains of treaſure; نسنجد بها می دهد کوه سنج " And beſtows on them uncounted gains."

RULE EIGHTH.

THE AORIST as well as the PRESENT tenſe is often employed to indicate the preſent ſtate of its own agent, as oppoſed to the condition of the ſame agent at any former period of time. Example: کفاف اندک دارم و عیال بسیار (میدارم) " I have little money and many children."

RULE NINTH.

THE AORIST (notwithſtanding the oppoſite opinion of certain Grammarians) is reſtricted to future time by means of the particles بِ or به. Examples: بِرَوَم " I will go;" نَرَوَم " I

will

will not go"; &c. And by means of any word ſignificant of future time; as فردا روم "I will go to-morrow;" &c.

RULE TENTH.

In a conditional ſentence compriſing a شرط and a جزا, the Aorist will be generally found to indicate future as oppoſed to preſent time. Example: اگر فرمائی او را خاموش کنم "If you give me orders, I will put him to ſilence." And the ſame rule is generally applicable to any ſentence compriſing a Relative Pronoun. Example: هر که خیانت ورزد "He who is guilty of fraud, دستش از حساب بلرزد will tremble when he comes to give in his account." Or to any ſentence following the words *When*, or *While*; &c. as تا رنج نبری گنج برنداری (نخواهی برداشت) "While you practice no induſtry, you will acquire no treaſure."

RULE ELEVENTH.

The uſe of an interrogative pronoun will generally reſtrict the Aorist to future time. Example: پیش که برم ز دست تو فریاد "To whom *ſhall* I complain of your intention againſt me." And the ſame effect will follow the uſe of an oath. Example: بعزت عظیم

و صحبت قدیم که دم برنیارم و قدم برندارم مگر آنگه که سخن گفته شود

"I ſwear by God, and by our ancient friendſhip, that I *will* not breathe, or move a ſtep from hence, until you have ſpoken."

RULE TWELFTH.

The. Aorist, following a verb in the imperative mode, will be generally reſtricted to future time. Example: چندانش بده که بی هوشی آورد "Give him wine enough to

bring

bring on intoxication;" &c. And ſo alſo, in the expreſſion of our prayers, hopes, fears, &c. Examples: خدا کند که ز من عشق دست بر دارد "God grant that Love may ceaſe to torture me;" امید دارم که در صحبت صالحان تربیت پذیرد "I hope that, in the ſociety of the virtuous, he may (or will) be formed to virtue."

RULE THIRTEENTH.

THE AORIST is ſometimes found to ſupercede the CONTINUATIVE PAST tenſe of the verb, on a principle which I do not clearly underſtand. Example:

اگر فرضاً در جمع کردن مال هیچ گونه مفسده جز حساب دادن و مدتی دور و دراز در آفتاب طاقت گداز روز جزا ایستادن نبودی مرد خردمند بایستی که برای همان مقدار دست تلاش پیوسته در آستین معاش کشیده دارد (کشیده می داشت) رفیع واعظ

"If the accumulation of property were followed by no evil but that of the neceſſity of giving an account, at the great day of judgment, of the uſes to which it has been applied, it would yet be incumbent on a wiſe man to refrain from the acquiſition of more than a competence."

CONCLUSION.

I AM ſomewhat aſhamed of the inſignificant nature of theſe rules, and ſhall therefore here put an end to the preſent Section of this Chapter, which might yet be extended by the inſertion of others of the ſame deſcription. Adverting to the nature of the PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE tenſes of a Perſian verb, it may, I believe, be accurately affirmed that the two former will often ſupply the place of the latter, according to the following principle: namely, becauſe it ſeems to be a natural operation of the mind to repreſent as preſent, or even as

paſt,

paſt, a given event which, though future, is nevertheleſs deemed to be of certain occurrence. The preſent may alſo ſupply the place of the paſt tenſe, whenever the ſpeaker is diſpoſed, by the aid of imagination, to recal the memory of former occurrences, and place them, as it were, before the eyes of his auditor: as "Now the army ruſh (ruſhed) to the breach," and other examples of the ſame nature. And on the contrary, I know of no principle by which the paſt and preſent tenſe of a verb can be accurately ſuperceded by the future tenſe; but the Aoriſt is a preſent, as well as a future tenſe of the verb, and may, therefore, be occaſionally obſerved to ſupply the place of its paſt tenſes. I now proceed to conſider the nature of the Imperative mode.

SECTION FOURTH.

أَمْر OR THE IMPERATIVE MODE.

The imperative is defined to be that form of the verb, by which "we require theperformance or ſufferance of an action, by a given object or ſubſtantive noun;" as بِخُواب "Sleep thou;" بِزَن "Strike thou;" زَدَه شَو "Be thou ſtruck;" &c. It is properly Imperative when addreſſed to an inferior; and has been termed Solicitive (عَرْض و اِلْتِمَاس) when addreſſed to an equal, and Precative (دُعَا) when addreſſed to the Deity, or to thoſe who are higher in rank than ourſelves.

It is rhetorically employed for various purpoſes; as that of expreſſing our aſſent to the performance of a given action: بَعْد اَنْجَام اِين كَار بِرَو "Go (if you pleaſe) after the completion of this affair;" or of conveying cenſure: as هَرْچِه خَواهِي كُن "Do what you pleaſe," addreſſed to a man who has refuſed to liſten

ten

ten to our admonitions: or of indicating the nature of our own wishes: as ای شب دراز شو که یارم در آغوش است "Extend, O NIGHT, the period of your duration, for now my mistress is strained to my bosom;" &c. The rhetorical application of the Imperative mode is obviously common to every language, and does not therefore stand in need of any illustration.

As this form of the verb is necessarily referable to future time, so it requires generally the use of the particle به (بیا ; برو ; &c.) which is seldom omitted, except in poetry, when the measure of the verse may happen to require it.

THE AORIST, or the FUTURE TENSE of the verb is sometimes found to supercede the Imperative; as شکر الهی بجا آر و بجا آری و بجا خواهی آورد "Perform (or you will perform) the duty of thanksgiving to God," and vice versa; as با رعیت صلح کن و از جنگ خصم ایمن نشین (خواهی نشست) "Treat your subjects kindly, and fear not (you need not fear) the hostile designs of your enemy;" &c.

THE IMPERATIVE of DURATION (امر مستمر) is formed, in the second person singular, by prefixing می or همی to the simple Imperative; as می کن or همی کن ; می رو or همی رو &c. Examples: سبزه می خور بگرد چشمه و جوی "Graze on the banks of the streams and fountains;" بهر سر سبزیش دعا می گوئی "And pray for his prosperity; &c. Indeed the particle می or همی seems to be accurately applicable to *all* the tenses and forms of a Persian verb; as می کن ; می کنم ; می کردم ; می کرده ام ; می کرده بودم ; می کرده باشم ; می خواهم کرد &c. &c. The Imperative of duration is also formed,

formed, through all its inflexions, by combining the paſt Active participle with the auxiliary باشم ; as كرده باشم ; كرده باشى ; كرده باشد ; &c. And the nature of the combination is perfectly obvious, ſince the paſt active participle muſt be here conſidered as the حال, employed to deſcribe the ſtate of the AGENT, or nominative to the verb; as فلان كار كنان باش, or in other words, فلان كار كرده باش "Continue in the ſtate of performing ſuch an action;" &c.

THE Imperative گو *Speak*, is often prefixed to another Imperative; as گو آن سنگ همان جا باش "Let the ſtone remain where it is," a form of conſtruction otherwiſe remarkable, ſince the Imperative باش ought, apparently, to have aſſumed the form of the third perſon ſingular, (گو آن سنگ همان جا باشد) which is alſo accurate, though, in this and other ſimilar examples, often ſuperceded by the ſecond perſon, for reaſons which I do not clearly underſtand. The word گو may alſo ſupply, occaſionally, the place of اگرچه *although*; as گو مشت خاك ما هم بر باد رفته باشد "Even though my body of clay may have been (or may be) deſtroyed;" &c.

THE Imperative خواه *Wiſh*, is alſo idiomatically employed to indicate the *equality* or deny the *difference* between two oppoſite propoſitions, conſidered with reference to the occurrence of either; and in this caſe it muſt be repeated in the ſentence, and will be generally tranſlated by "Whether or not;" as كانچه بنيادى ندارد خواه هست و خواه نيست "That which has no ſolid foundation, it ſignifies nothing whether it exiſts or not;" &c. It is poſſible that other Imperatives may be idiomatically employed for various purpoſes which do not at preſent occur to my recollection; and if ſo, they muſt be left to the acquiſition of practical ſtudy. The Imperative بار, which is employed in prayer, may be ſometimes obſerved to

aſſume

assume the form بادی, in the second person singular; as

عمر بادت که هست بخت یار
بادی از عمر و بخت بر خوردار

" May your life endure, for your fortune is prosperous; may you reap the fruits of life and glory!" &c.

The Imperative is very commonly followed by a sentence significant of the motive proposed to incite obedience; as " Read that you may learn;" &c. and this sentence is known to Grammarians by the term جواب امر " The answer to the verb in the Imperative mode." In the Persian language, it generally follows the particles تا, or کہ, or تاکہ, or more rarely کہ تا; as

زاهدا از کوچهٔ رندان بسلامت بگذر
تا خرابت نکند صحبت بدنامی چند   حافظ

" Leave in peace the haunts of the dissolute, O thou (pure and spotless) devotee! that so (تا, or کہ, or تا کہ, or کہ تا,) the society of the vicious may not contaminate the (boasted) purity of your sacred character." There is nevertheless a difference of sense between تا and کہ, the nature of which will soon be explained.

The Imperative is sometimes omitted in speech; as ای دوستان مددی فرمایید for ای دوستان مددی " Assistance, O my friends!" and sometimes the answer is prefixed to the Imperative mode: as

تا بر دلش از غصه غباری ننشیند
ای سیل سرشک از عقب نامه روان باش

" O! that my tears would follow my letter, and serve to allay the dust of her anger!" Or the answer may follow the Imperative, after the intervention of another sentence: as

صبوز

صوفی بیا که آینه صافست جام را

تا بنگری صفای می لعل فام را حافظ

" Come, O Soofee! for the glaſs is clear; and behold the luſtre of the ruby colored wine."

نهی, or the Prohibitive.

The Prohibitive is formed from the Imperative, in the ſecond perſons ſingular and plural by prefixing the letter میم; as مکن ; مکشید ; and elſewhere by means of the letter نون ; as نکنم ; نکشیم ; نکند ; نکشند ; &c. It demands that the party addreſſed ſhall *deſiſt* from the performance or ſufferance of a given action: as مخواب " Do not thou ſleep;" مزن " Do not thou beat;" زده مشو " Be not thou beaten;" &c.

The anſwer to the Prohibitive (جواب نهی) is a ſentence of the ſame nature with the جواب امر which has been juſt now explained; and generally follows the particle تا, which is itſelf commonly followed by a negative particle: as بر خلق تنگ مگیر تا ترا تنگ نگیرند " Do not treat the people harſhly, that they may not injure you." There are indeed but two caſes, ſo far as I have been able to obſerve, in which the particle تا, after the نهی may be accurately followed by an affirmative ſentence: namely, *firſt*, when the verb is prohibitive by its own ſignification: as مانع مشو تا بدر روم " Do not hinder me from going out;" and *ſecondly*, in ſuch examples as the following: ظلم مکن تا ملک آبادان شود " Do not practiſe oppreſſion,

that so your Empire may flourish;" which is nearly equivalent to the negative ستم مکن تا ملک ویران نشود " Do not practise oppression, that so your Empire may *not* go to ruin."

Now the words ما منع مشو تا بدر روم obviously contain *two* negatives; namely, that comprised in the sense of the verb To HINDER, and that comprised in the prohibitive particle; and both together make an affirmative: اجازت ده تا بدر روم " Permit me to go out;" which is probably the reason why the particle تا is not here followed by a negative particle. And the sentence ستم مکن تا ملک ویران نشود is better Persian, according to my judgment, (because more commonly used in the Language) than ستم مکن تا ملک آبادان گردد: yet there is no error in substituting the affirmative آبادان گردد; for the negative ویران نشود; because the same proposition may, in every Language, be every where expressed according to the pleasure of the speaker either in its positive or negative form: as when we say of a man that " He is *not* clean in his person;" or, in other words, that " He is positively dirty."

WITH these two exceptions (and both are comparatively speaking of rare occurrence in the Language) I believe that the particle تا after the نہی will be invariably followed by a negative particle: and, according to the opinion which I have just now stated, it is more common perhaps, and therefore more consistent with Persian idiom, to say کفر مکن تا در دوزخ نروی " Be not an infidel that you may *not* go to Hell," (in the negative) than it is to say کفر مکن تا در جنت در آیی " Be not an infidel that you *may* go to Heaven," where تا is followed by an affirmative sentence.

But the prohibitive is often followed by the particle که having a double sense; namely, that of تا already mentioned; as کافر مشو که در دوزخ نروی "Be not an infidel that you may *not* go to Hell;" or (which is equally common after که, though not perhaps after تا) کافر مشو که در جنّت در آئی "Be not an infidel, that you *may* go to Heaven;" and that of و الّا *Otherwise*; as کافر مشو که در دوزخ روی "Be not an infidel, otherwise you *will* go to Hell;" &c. It is obvious, therefore, that the context can alone determine between these two senses of the particle که; and that whether we say روی in the affirmative, or نروی in the negative form, the sense of the sentence remains unchanged. So, also, in the following and every similar Example:

مده رخصت ظلم در هیچ حال

که خورشید ملکت نیابد زوال

"Never suffer the practise of tyranny, that the sun of your Empire may *not* set;" (which is the best reading) or "Never suffer the practise of tyranny, otherwise the sun of your Empire *will* set:" (which is also accurate, if we substitute بیابد for نیابد in the second line.)

This is the difference of sense between تا and که to which I referred a little way back; and the reader will easily perceive that it must be the same, whether these particles shall follow the Imperative or the Prohibitive mode. Examples: رخ بر افروز که فارغ کنی از برگ گلم (تا فارغ کنی از برگ گلم) "Display the light of your countenance, that so you may detach my heart from the rose;" ازین جا در گذر که کشته شوی

or

or که کشته نشوی ; or تا کشته نشوی ; but not تا کشته شوی ; "Get away from hence, otherwise you *will* be slain," or that "you may *not* be slain;" &c. The words ازین جا درگذر تا کشته شوی would signify inevitably "Get away from hence that you *may* be slain;" and cannot possibly have any other sense.

SECTION FIFTH.

GENERAL PRINCIPLE.

Having now detailed the rules that relate to the application of the simple tenses of a Persian verb, including also the Imperative mode, it is obvious to remark that the application of the compound tenses, کرده است ; کرده بود ; کرده باشد &c. depends on the use of the auxiliaries است ; بود ; and باشد ; employed in the formation of such tenses. And as the use of those auxiliaries has already been discussed in Chapter Second, Page 298 of this volume, so it is wholly unnecessary to resume the consideration of that subject, already exhausted to the best of my ability.

It remains, therefore, to point out to the notice of the learner one general principle, which will be found to have considerable influence on the application of all the tenses of a Persian verb.

By the use of language, we are enabled to express our own sentiments, or to repeat the sentiments of other men; and, in the latter case, we may have recourse to Simple Narrative which is the common practise of the English Language; or to what may be termed Dramatic Narrative, which is more consistent with the idiom of the Persian Tongue. By Simple narrative, I mean "the repetition of sentiments expressed in the language of the narrator himself;" as "James in-

informed me of his intention to leave Calcutta at a given time;" or "JAMES told me that he meant to leave Calcutta at a given time;" &c. And by DRAMATIC NARRATIVE, I mean "The retention, by the narrator, of the *very ſame* expreſſions which are ſuppoſed to have been uttered by the original ſpeaker;" as "James told me I MEAN TO LEAVE CALCUTTA AT A GIVEN TIME;" in which caſe, the phraſe "I mean to leave Calcutta at a given time;" is obviouſly aſſumed to have been uttered by JAMES. But we are accuſtomed to divine, and of courſe to narrate, the perceptions of other men, or what we conceive to be their perceptions, even though theſe have not been previouſly uttered: as "The lady perceived that her lover was captivated;" or "The lover obſerved that his miſtreſs was diſpoſed to favour his ſuit." And in this caſe alſo, a Perſian is at liberty to aſſume the form of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE; as "The lady perceived *my* lover is captivated;" "The lover obſerved *my* miſtreſs is diſpoſed to favor my ſuit," &c. It is the object of the following rules to illuſtrate the application of this general principle to the purpoſes of ſpeech.

RULE FIRST.

THE Narrator, having occaſion to relate a converſation previouſly held between himſelf and another, will generally (I believe invariably in writing) aſſume the form of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE as already explained. Ex: زید گفت که در کلکته می روم "ZYDE informed me that he was going to Calcutta;" or more literally, "ZYDE ſaid, I AM GOING TO CALCUTTA;" which is the only form of conſtruction conſiſtent with the written idiom of the Perſian Tongue. In converſation, I believe the form of ſimple Narrative may be ſometimes, though rarely, obſerved to occur: as زید گفت که در کلکته خواهد رفت or زید گفت که در کلکته می رود "ZYDE ſaid that he would go to Calcutta."

حکایت

یکی از رفیقان شکایت روزگار نامساعد بنزدیک من آورد که کفاف اندک

دارم و عیال بسیار و طاقت بار فاقه ندارم و بارها در دلم آمد که باقلیم دیگر نقل
کنم تا در آن صورت که زندگانی کنم کسی را بر نیک و بد من اطلاع نباشد باز از شماتت
اعدا بر اندیشم که بطعنه در قفای من بخندند و سعی مرا در حق عیال بر عدم مروت
حمل کنند و در علم محاسبه چنانکه معلوم است چیزی دانم اگر بجاه شما جهتی معین گردد که
موجب جمعیت خاطر باشد بقیه عمر از عهده شکر آن نتوانم بیرون آمدن گفتم ای یار
عمل پادشاه دو طرف دارد امید نان و بیم جان و خلاف رای خردمندان
است بدان امید در این بیم افتادن دیدم که متغیر می شود و نصیحت من به غرض
می شنود نزدیک صاحب دیوان رفتم بسابقه معرفتی که میان ما بود و صورت
حالش بگفتم تا بکاری مختصرش نصب کردند چند روز برین برآمد لطف طبعش
بدیدند و حسن تدبیرش بپسندیدند کارش از آن درگذشت و به مرتبه برتر از آن
متمکن شد و نجم سعادتش در ترقی بود تا باوج ارادت رسید و مقرب حضرت
سلطان و معتمد علیه گشت در آن مدت مرا با جمع یاران اتفاق سفر مکه افتاد
چون باز آمدم دو منزلم استقبال کرد ظاهر حالش دیدم پریشان و در هیات
درویشان گفتم حال چیست گفت چنانکه تو گفتی طائفه حسد بردند و بخیانتم
منسوب کردند الی آخره

سعدی

“ One

"One of my friends complained to me of his evil fortune, saying 'I have little money and many children, and am no longer able to bear the miseries of want. I have often thought of going to another country, that live how I may, my condition may at least be unknown to others. Yet I fear the malice of my enemies, lest they should laugh in my absence, and impute to inhumanity my endeavours to provide for the wants of my family. Now you know that I have some skill in accounts; and if, through your interest, some means of support should be found for me, the remainder of my life will be insufficient for the grateful discharge of such an obligation.' I replied 'O my friend! the service of Kings offers a double prospect, the hope of bread, and the fear of destruction; and to encounter the one for the sake of the other, is not consistent with the counsels of the wise." I saw that he was (is) offended, and listened (listens) with dislike to my admonitions. I went to the master of the office of accounts and revenue, and in virtue of our previous intimacy together, represented to him the case of my friend, who was accordingly appointed to a trifling office. After a certain time, his genius and the approved merit of his management in office, obtained for him a higher situation; and the star of his prosperity continued to ascend, until at last he attained the summit of his wishes, and became a distinguished favorite of the King. It happened that I had then occasion to travel to Mecca, with my friends; and on my return home, he advanced two stages to meet me. I remarked the wretchedness of his appearance, and found that he had assumed the guise of a pauper. I asked 'what was (is) the matter?' to which he replied, 'as you foretold, a faction were inspired with envy, and brought against me a charge of peculation;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

The Narrator, having occasion to relate a conversation previously held between two other persons, will generally,

rally, perhaps invariably in writing, aſſume the ſtyle of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE. Examples: زَیْد بِه بَکْر گُفْت کِه دَرْ کَلْکَتَّه می رَوَم "ZYDE ſaid to BUKR, *I am* going to Calcutta," زَیْد بِه بَکْر گُفْت کِه دَرْ کَلْکَتَّه بِرَوْ وَ دَرْ کَلْکَتَّه بَایَد رَفْت وَ خَواهی رَفْت ZYDE ſaid to BUKR, GO TO CALCUTTA; or, YOU WILL OR MUST GO TO CALCUTTA; &c. This is more conſiſtent with Perſian idiom, than it would be to ſay زَیْد بِه بَکْر گُفْت کِه دَرْ کَلْکَتَّه بِرَوَد "ZYDE deſired BUKR to go to Calcutta;" which is the form of ſimple narrative, perhaps occaſionally obſerved to occur in converſation.

حکایت

روزی در خدمت مامون بودم نگینی از یاقوت دیدم مقدار چهار انگشت و در عرض دو انگشت و در صفا و روشنی چون خورشید تابان و ناهید درخشان بود پس زرگری را بخواند و گفت خاتمی بساز که این یاقوت نگین آن تواند بود زرگر یاقوت برگرفت و برفت قضارا روزی دیگر هم در خدمت وی بودم که از ان انگشتری یاد کرد و بفرمود تا زرگر را بیاورند چون زرگر حاضر شد دیدم که رعشه بروی افتاده است و چون بید می لرزد مامون پرسید که سبب تغیر تو چیست گفت مرا امان ده تا بگویم گفت امان دادم زرگر نگین بیرون کرد به چهار پاره شده گفت ای خلیفه انگشتری ساختم و خواستم که نگین را بر نگین دان برم از دست من بر سندان افتاد و به چهار پاره شد مامون تبسّم کرد و گفت برو و این را چهار انگشتری بساز و ترا هیچ گناهی نیست و این صورت که از مامون صادر شد غایت حلم و بردباری است

"I

"I WAS one day in company with the KHULEEFA MAMOON, and there ſaw a Ruby, of four-fingers by two and a half, in luſtre equal to the SUN or the Planet VENUS. MAMOON ſent for a goldſmith, and ſaid to him, 'Make a ring for this ſtone.' The goldſmith took it accordingly, and went away. It happened that I was preſent on another occaſion, when MAMOON recollected the ring, and ſent for the goldſmith, who appeared accordingly; and I obſerved, that he was (is) trembling like the leaf of a willow. MAMOON aſked him what was (is) the cauſe of his (your) uneaſineſs? He replied "Give me protection and I will inform you." MAMOON rejoined, "I give (have given) you protection." The goldſmith took out the ruby broken into four pieces, and ſaid, "O Prince! I made the ring, and was about to ſet the ſtone in the ſocket, when it fell from my hand on the anvil, and broke, as you perceive, into four pieces. MAMOON ſmiled and ſaid "Go then and make it into four rings, for this was (is) no fault of yours." The conduct of MAMOON, on this occaſion, exhibits an inſtance of the utmoſt clemency and forbearance."

RULE THIRD.

THE narrator having occaſion to relate the ſentiments of another man, previouſly delivered in writing, or in any form but that of converſation, will generally aſſume the ſtyle of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE. In this caſe, he may nevertheleſs, aſſume the form of SIMPLE NARRATIVE in written compoſition; though its aſſumption muſt, I believe, be conſidered as of rare occurrence in the Language. The following is an example of SIMPLE NARRATIVE, eaſily converted into the DRAMATIC form, by means of the alterations inſerted between parentheſes.

سکندر ذو القرنین در وقت وفات وصیت کرد که دستش (دستم) را از تابوت بیرون گذارند تا عالمیان معاینه کنند که با آن ملک و مال عاقبت تهی دست می رود

می رود (می روم) و از کوچگاه دار فنا بعالم بقا انتقال کرد (کردم) و از آن همه خزائن و دفائن موفور جز دست تهی با خود چیزی بگور نبرده (نبردم)

الی آخره

"ALEXANDER surnamed ZOOL KURNYNE, at the period of his death, directed in his will that his (my) hands might (or may) be left out of the coffin, exposed to public view; that so, all men might (or may) see that with all his (or my) power and wealth, he (or I) quitted the world empty-handed, and carried nothing to the grave, of the abundant treasure which he (or I) possessed in his (or my) life." &c.

RULE FOURTH.

THE narrator, having occasion to state the unuttered conceptions of another man, or what he (the narrator) believes to be his thoughts or conceptions, will generally assume the style of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE. Examples: پسر دانست که دل آویختهٔ من است "The youth knew that such a man was fond of him; or more literally "The youth knew that SUCH A MAN IS FOND OF ME," (the youth.) But in this case, the form of SIMPLE NARRATIVE, though of rare occurrence, may be sometimes observed in written composition. Example from SAUDEE: پسر دانست که دل آویختهٔ اوست "The youth knew that such a man was fond of him;" و این گرد بلا انگیختهٔ او : "And that the dust of mischief had been excited by him;" (the youth.) &c.

CONCLUSION.

IT follows from all the preceding rules, that the form of SIMPLE NARRATIVE, though sometimes admissible, is always at variance with the common usage of the Persian Tongue. And

on

on the contrary, the form of DRAMATIC NARRATIVE is always congenial with Perſian idiom, whether applied in the manner deſcribed in the rules, or to any other of the purpoſes of ſpeech. On the other hand the happy and verſatile genius of our Language is eaſily accommodated to either idiom; and though of the two, ſimple narrative is perhaps more conſonant to the common uſage of the Language, it is nevertheleſs true that the dramatic form of narration may be always accurately aſſumed by an Engliſh ſpeaker, if not with elegance, at leaſt without the danger of being unintelligible to his hearer on any occaſion. On the contrary, the Anglo-Perſian ſcholar, who ventures to aſſume the form of ſimple narrative, will be very generally unintelligible to his hearers; and hence follows obviouſly an important rule of Perſian tranſlation, by which the writer is generally bound " to convert into the dramatic form, thoſe ſimple narratives that are to be tranſlated into Perſian, from the Engliſh or other European Tongues." It is only neceſſary to add, that the ſentiments of the narrator himſelf may be ſometimes miſtaken for thoſe of the perſon whoſe condition he deſcribes, though a little attention to the context will eaſily enable us to rectify the error if it ſhould happen to occur. Thus NEZAUMEE, having occaſion to deſcribe the repentance of NOWSHERAWAUN for the commiſſion of certain acts of injuſtice into which he had been led in the beginning of his reign, adds a general obſervation on the effects of injuſtice, which might poſſibly, at firſt ſight, be imputed to NOWSHERAWAUN.

دست بسر برزد و لختی گریست
حاصل بیداد بجز گریه چیست

" HE ſtruck his hand on his head, and wept for a time; what, but weeping, is the reſult of injuſtice!"

SECTION

SECTION SIXTH.

ON THE APPLICATION OF VERBS CONSIDERED AS لازم و متعدی OR NEUTER AND TRANSITIVE.

All intranſitive verbs are conſidered as neuter by the Perſian Grammarians; and thus the verb رفتن *To go*, which has been termed active intranſitive by Engliſh writers, is conſidered by them as a neuter verb. An active verb, as گستردن *To ſpread*, is alſo termed neuter with reference to the cauſal verb گسترانیدن which is formed from it; becauſe the verb گستردن requires but one object, whereas گسترانیدن admits of two.

The ſame verb may be at once neuter and active, as سوختن *To burn;* and provided the ſenſe of a neuter verb ſhall be found to exiſt in the agent or nominative, it ſignifies nothing whether his *will* has any thing to do in the matter or not: as ایستادم *I ſtood*, which is a voluntary action; مردم *I died*, which is by no means voluntary. This view of the ſubject has given occaſion to the following metrical commentary on the Agent or Nominative to a nueter verb.

مات زیدٌ زید چون فاعل بود   بلکه فاعل نیست او عاطل بود
او ز روی نحو لفظا فاعل ست   ورنه او مقتول و موتش قاتل ست

"Zyde died! How can Zyde be the agent of the verb! He is not the agent; he is altogether paſſive. He is the agent, indeed, in the language of Grammar; but in fact he is the object or ſufferer, (or perſon ſlain) and Death is the executioner who has made an end of him."

I have nothing to obſerve on the application of neuter verbs to the purpoſes of ſpeech; and the rules that relate to the accuſative

cuſative or object of a tranſitive verb have already been detailed in CHAPTER VII, PAGE 189 of this volume. It remains to conſider the application of verbs tranſitive to more than a ſingle object; and the few unimportant obſervations that occur on the ſubject, are accordingly detailed in the following rules.

RULE FIRST.

OF two objects to the ſame verb, the firſt may ſtand to the ſecond in the relation of the فاعل to the مفعول به; and in this caſe, the firſt will be ſeldom inſerted in the ſentence. Example: زید فرش گسترانید "ZYDE cauſed (BUKR or any body elſe) to ſpread the carpet;" &c. Now, it is obvious, that the firſt object BUKR is here the *ſpreader* of the carpet; and the CARPET itſelf is the *thing ſpread;* from which it follows that they ſtand, with reference to each other, in the relation of the فاعل to the مفعول به. In ſuch examples, the firſt object (BUKR) is very ſeldom inſerted in ſpeech, or if inſerted, it muſt generally (perhaps invariably) follow the prepoſition از. Example: زید از بکر فرش گسترانید "ZYDE cauſed BUKR to ſpread the carpet;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

OF two objects to the ſame verb, the ſecond may be an attributive applicable to the firſt; and in this caſe, both muſt be invariably inſerted in the ſentence, and the firſt will follow the termination را. Examples: زید دیوار را بلند ساخت "ZYDE made the wall high;" بکر زید را توانگر گردانید "BUKR enriched ZYDE," or "made ZYDE rich;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

OF two objects to the ſame verb, the one may ſtand to the other in the relation of the receiver to the thing received;

and, in this caſe, the مفعول به or true object of the verb, (namely, that noun which is in the accuſative caſe) will receive or reject the termination را according to the rules detailed in CHAPTER VII, PAGE 189 of this volume, for the rejection or inſertion of that termination. In the event of its inſertion, the other object muſt receive the particle به; and in the caſe of its omiſſion, it may receive that particle or the termination را. Examples: اسباب خانه را بزید سپردم "I committed the houſehold furniture to ZYDE;" مبلغی از زر زید را دادم or مبلغی از زر بزید دادم "I gave ZYDE a ſum of money;" &c. Both or either object are often omitted in ſpeech after the verbs of this claſs; *firſt*, becauſe we have ſometimes occaſion to define merely the nature of the action itſelf; as زید می دهد و می بخشد "ZYDE gives and beſtows;" *ſecondly*, becauſe we have ſometimes occaſion to define excluſively the object of bounty, without reference to the thing beſtowed; as زید بہ بکر می دهد "ZYDE gives (money, &c.) to BUKR;" and, *finally*, becauſe we have ſometimes occaſion to define the thing beſtowed without reference to the object of bounty; as زید اسپ می دهد و زر می بخشد "ZYDE gives away horſes and money;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

OF two objects to the verbs گفتن, فرمودن, or any other verbs having the ſame, or nearly the ſame ſenſe, the one is often a perfect ſentence, and the other, being a ſimple ſubſtantive noun, will commonly receive the particles به ; را; or با; &c. Example: بزید و با زید و زید را گفتم که ادب آموز "I ſaid to ZYDE: LEARN MANNERS;" &c. In this caſe, the ſentence generally follows the verb: but ſome exceptions may be

be found in poetry; as چرا گفتم نشبرا ندر نسیائی " I said Why do you not enter the city;" where the verb follows the Interrogative چرا; &c. The particle گ is often omitted; as زید را گفتم ادب آموز; or, in the case of a command, superceded by تا; as بفرمود تا اسپ را زین کنند "He gave orders to saddle the horse;" &c. The omission of either object depends on the existence of a قرینه, by which the hearer may be enabled to supply its absence: as گر بر آنی که براني بکه بر خوانم گفت (آن را) "If you are determined to drive me away, to whom shall I state (the case;") &c.

RULE FIFTH.

Of two objects to the same verb, the first may stand to the second in the relation of the Subject to the Predicate of a given preposition: as "Zyde saw, knew, thought, or believed, Amr to be learned or virtuous;" &c. or "Zyde knew that Amr was learned," which is equivalent to the phrase "Zyde knew the learning of Amr." There is therefore, properly speaking, but one object (namely, *the learning of* Amr, which is the sense of the sentence,) to any given verb of this class; and the verbs themselves are termed افعال القلوب or Verbs of Perception, because they indicate operations of the mind, in which the members of the body have no share. In another sense, they cease to be verbs of perception, requiring, in that case, but one object: as "Zyde saw Amr;" "Zyde knew Bukr;" &c. In the Persian Language, they are commonly followed by a perfect sentence: as زید دانست که بکر دانا ست "Zyde knew Bukr to be wise;" and the other form of construction, namely زید دانائی بکر دانست "Zyde knew the wisdom of Bukr," though not inaccurate, is of rare occurrence.

RULE SIXTH.

A verb may be tranſitive to three objects; as in the caſe of دهانیدن ; آموزانیدن ; &c. In this caſe, one of the objects will follow the prepoſition از ; another will be followed by the termination را ; and the third will receive the prepoſitions به or با. Example: علم را بزید آموزانیدم از فلان " I made ſuch a man teach Zyde knowledge." Or, in the event of the omiſſion of را after the firſt object, it may be accurately given to the ſecond: as زید را علم آموزانیدم از فلان " I cauſed ſuch a man to teach Zyde knowledge;" &c. Any one or all theſe objects may be occaſionally omitted in ſpeech: as in the common phraſe, خدای دهاند خدای دهد " God gives and is the cauſe of giving;" زید زری دهاند Zyde cauſes money to be given;" &c.

SECTION SEVENTH.

ON THE INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS.

The tenſes of a Perſian verb are inflected into the firſt, ſecond, and third perſons, ſingular and plural; as گفتم ; گفتی ; گفت ; گفتیم ; گفتید ; گفتند ; &c. And the natural application of theſe perſons to the purpoſes of ſpeech, is too obvious to require, or even to admit of illuſtration by the rules of Grammar. I ſhall therefore, in the preſent ſection of this Chapter, merely point out to the notice of the learner, certain *deviations* from the order of nature, which have been generally adopted in the Perſian Language, in order to mark the reſpect of the ſpeaker for thoſe whom he may have occaſion to addreſs.

RULE FIRST.

In the Perſian, as in other tongues, the common forms of politeneſs generally require the uſe of the plural number,

when

when we addreſs or ſpeak of a given individual who happens to be of equal or higher rank than ourſelves. Example; یا امیر المومنین سبب چیست که شما در تلبس جامهٔ درشت اکتفا فرموده اید "O commander of the faithful! why do you chuſe to appear habited in veſtments of coarſe cloth?" آن حضرت این مضمون را ادا فرمودند "His Majeſty or His Excellency obſerved as follows;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

The Deity muſt be addreſſed in the ſingular number, becauſe there is an obvious impropriety in applying to him the idea of plurality. Examples: یا الٰهی بده تو توفیقم "O God! Grant me grace;" حق تعالی چنین گفت "The moſt high God has thus ſpoken;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

By a refined form of civility common to the Perſian and to moſt other Tongues, the ſingular number is often applied to a given individual, for the purpoſe of denoting that the exaltation of his rank, or his eminence for virtue, learning, or talents, &c, is ſuch as to render the common forms of reſpect inapplicable to him. Example:

جرأت من در آمدن به حضرت تو و نا ترسیدن از عقوبت
تو از آن عفو تو بزرگ تر نخواهد بود

"The clemency of your diſpoſition is greater than my boldneſs in coming into your preſence, and braving the puniſhment that you may inflict;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

The pomp of Eaſtern manners has permitted the private gentlemen of Asia to aſſume the regal ſtyle of Europe;

 and

and they seldom fail to employ it, by issuing, in the first person plural, their sublime commands to their inferiors, or to those with whom they may happen to converse. Examples: او را چنین فرمودیم "I thus commanded or spoke to him;" ترا چنین ارشاد کردیم "I thus commanded or directed you;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

Between equals, the forms of politeness usually require that each party should modify his address on the supposition that he himself is inferior in rank to the other. Ex: بنده عرض کردم "Your slave observed;" نیازمند التماس نمودم "Your dependant mentioned;" &c. The rule being impartially applicable to both parties, there is here no degradation on either side; and we might as reasonably refuse to finish an English letter in the ordinary terms established by custom, as to comply with this equally unmeaning ceremony. The use of the first person (بنده عرض کردم) is here more idiomatical, or at least more commonly established in modern Persia, than that of the third; (بنده عرض کرد) which generally prevails in Hindoostaun, and indeed among the writers of ancient Persia. Let us suppose an ellipsis in the sentence; (من بنده عرض کردم "I your slave mentioned,") or let us admit with the Persians, that the letter م is the pronominal nominative to the verb کردم; and the grammatical accuracy of the phrase will be easily defensible in either case.

RULE SIXTH.

The servility of India has the merit of surpassing that of Persia; and hence it happens that Indian gentlemen have, in a great measure, banished from their conversation the use of the first and second personal pronouns, and of the first

and

and second persons of the verb. In addressing a superior, they seem to proceed on the supposition that they are wholly unworthy of being admitted into his presence, and therefore designate both parties in the third person; جناب بنده چنین ارشاد فرمودند "His Excellency thus commanded his slave;" &c. as if neither party were present in the room. Nay, they will often go farther; and meaning to enquire into the state of the superior's health, will deliberately ask him, "How his august *servants* do this morning," (مزاج ملازمان عالی امروز چه حال دارد) or when he happens to be ill, "What sickness or accident has befallen his *enemies*?" (شنیده شد که به نصیب اعدا کسالتی روی داده "I have heard that an illness has happened to your enemies;") by which they mean to intimate their wishes for his prosperity, and the destruction of his foes. The Language moves on heavily under the load of such cumbrous fetters as these; and the ends of flattery have been long since lost in the mere common place of customary speech. It would require a quarto volume to illustrate the written forms adulatory address, and I shall very willingly decline the performance of the task, and bequeath it as a legacy to my successor in office.

It remains only to mark the occasional use of the third for the first person singular of the verb, according to the principle already noticed in PAGE 65 of this volume.

EXAMPLE FROM JAUMEE.

بجای نیل من بودی چه بودی   زپابوسش من آسودی چه بودی

"Would that I had supplied the place of the river NILE! that I had enjoyed the happiness of kissing his feet! (the feet of JOSEPH)." The reader will easily perceive that the words من بودی and من آسودی are here used for من بودمی ; من آسودمی

ن آموزی ; and there are many other examples of the same nature.

SECTION EIGHTH.

Occasional Omission of Persian Verbs.

As the Persian Language delights in the abbreviations of speech above all others with which I have any acquaintance, so it often happens, and more especially in poetry, that verbs and whole members of a sentence are elegantly omitted whenever the context is of such a nature as to enable the reader to supply the omission. I believe, however, that the subject is too indefinite in its own nature to admit of much illustration by the rules of Grammar; and the examples comprised in the following rules, are therefore offered, merely as a *specimen*, with a view to excite the attention of the reader, to a hundred others that will fall in his way.

RULE FIRST.

In a conditional sentence, the verb may be accurately omitted in the first member of the sentence whenever it shall happen to be expressed in the second. Example: گر دگران ریش تو مرهم کنی "If others have wounded, be it your business to heal;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

In a conditional sentence, the verb is sometimes omitted in the second member of the sentence, whenever it happens to be expressed in the first. Example:

تنی چند بر گفت او مجتمع   چو عالم نباشی کم از مستمع

"Several men were listening to his conversation. If you are not learned, be at least a listener;" (کم از مستمع مباش ;) &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

In a conditional ſentence, the ſecond member is often *wholly* omitted, in order to make way for ſome other ſentence of ſuch a nature as to enable the reader to ſupply the omiſſion. Examples: ناسزائی را چو بینی بختیار عاقلان تسلیم کردند اختیار

"When you ſee the unworthy favored by fortune, (اختیار کن تسلیم را do you be reſigned to the will of God) for ſuch has been generally the conduct of the wiſe." گر از نیستی دیگری شد هلاک ترا هست و بط را ز طوفان چه باک "If another have ſuffered from the want of means to eſcape, you have the means, (ترا مایهٔ جمعیت هست) and what has a duck to fear from the ſtorm?" that is to ſay, "you cannot ſuffer, having in your poſſeſſion the means to eſcape;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

In the caſe of a parenthetical ſentence, the verb is very commonly omitted. Examples: زید یادش بخیر چنین گفت "Zyde (may he be remembered with praiſe) thus obſerved;" بکر رویش سیاه چنین حرکت نمود "Bukr (may his face be black) thus acted;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

In the caſe of warning, the verb پرهیز کن *Beware*, is very commonly omitted, and muſt be ſupplied in order to complete the ſtructure of the ſentence. In this caſe, the object of that verb follows, invariably, the prepoſition از. Example: ازین گربه گون خاک تا چند چند بشیری توان کرد نقش گرگ بند

"Beware of this treacherous world;" (پرهیز کن ازین گربه گون خاک) "How long will your courage ſerve you to maſter it," or, in other words, "It will one day or other maſter you." So alſo in the following lines of Saudee; ſince there is no verb expreſſed in any

any part of the poem, with which to connect the preposition از.

ازین مه پارهٔ عابد فریبی ملایک صورتی طاوس زیبی

" Beware of this beautiful lady, with a face like the moon, the form of an angel, the splendor of a peacock, and grace to seduce the abstinent hermit;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

THE verb will be often omitted in the حال; when it happens to occur as a perfect sentence applicable to the ذوالحال. Example: گر آوازم دهی من مرده در گور بر آساید روانِ دردمندم

" If you speak to me when I am dead in the grave, it will be the means of rest to my wounded spirit." N. B. The word من is not here followed by the vowel کسرهٔ توصیفی.

RULE SEVENTH.

THE verbs گفت, فرمود, &c. are very commonly omitted in poetry; but in such a manner that the omission is easily supplied by the understanding of the reader. Example:

درو دید چون اژدها بر گوزن بخشمی که دور افتد از سنگ وزن

که در من چه نرم آهنی دیدهٔ که پولاد او را پسندیدهٔ نظامی

" He looked at him frowning, with an eye kindled into rage, as a dragon looks at his distined prey; (the elk) *saying*, " What weakness of disposition have you observed in me, that you presume to prefer the steel of *his* temper?"

RULE EIGHTH.

THE words پنداری; پنداشتی; گویا; گویی; گفتی; are commonly used to signify " You might say;" or " You might have said;" " You might suppose;" or " You might have thought;" &c. And are generally employed in the case of a simile, which the poet, by way of hyperbole, chuses to put into

the

the mouth of his reader. They ſeem, therefore, to ſupply the place of the continuative preterite, and may be conſidered as the جزا of a شرط, which is underſtood in the ſentence: *namely,* اگر تو می دیدی چنین می گفتی "Had you ſeen it, you would have ſaid;" &c. Examples: تو گفتی که هرگز زمادر نزاد "You might have ſaid (had you ſeen him) that he had never been born;" (a hyberbole of Firdousee, meant to indicate the effectual manner in which one of his warriors had put his enemy to death;") تو گوئی دو گوشم بر آواز اوست "You might ſay that my two ears were faſtened to his voice;" گویا زیاد برده روز حساب را "You ſeem to have forgotten the day of judgment;" پنداشتی که آفتاب بر آمد "You might have miſtaken her for the riſing ſun;" (the poet is ſpeaking of the appearance of his miſtreſs;) که پنداری اللیل یغشی النهار "You might ſuppoſe that the night covers and conceals the day;" (alluding, probably, to the black hair hanging over the face of ſome fair damſel:) &c.*

The word گویا is merely a contraction for گویا; or گوئی in the ſecond perſon ſingular followed by Alif; and the uncontracted گوئیا is ſometimes, though rarely, obſerved to occur: as گوئیا نقش لبت از جان شیرین بسته اند "Your lips may be ſaid to be formed of the matter of ſpirit;" &c.

SECTION NINTH.

Of the relation existing between the شرط and the جزا

The relation between the شرط and the جزا ſeems to be that of cause and effect; for if it be affirmed that "If you

* We are apt, and certainly with juſtice, to cenſure the extravagance of Eaſtern metaphor. I know not whether the critics will ſuſtain my admiration of that which follows, but I am at leaſt certain, that it is conceived and expreſſed in the true magnificence of Oriental taſte.

"O ſhe doth teach the torches to burn bright!
"Her beauty hangs upon the cheek of night,
"Like a rich jewel in an Ethiops ear."

fit

ſit I will ſit;" "If you ſtand I will ſtand;" &c. it is obvious that my "ſitting," or "ſtanding," is made to depend on yours, as every effect depends on its cauſe. The ſame thing is true of every general propoſition, expreſſed by means of a relative pronoun; for if we affirm that "The man that hath not muſic in his ſoul, is fit for treaſons, ſtratagems, and ſpoils," it follows obviouſly, that the malconformation of the poor man's ear is treated by the ſpeaker as the cauſe of his fitneſs for ſuch alarming enterpriſes.

But if the relation be that of CAUSE and EFFECT, it ſhould ſeem to follow that there muſt be, invariably, ſome difference of ſenſe between the two propoſitions compriſed in either member of the ſentence; and for this plain reaſon, *namely*, "becauſe the ſame propoſition cannot be at once the cauſe and effect of itſelf." Accordingly, the propoſition compriſed in the جزا, generally differs from that contained in the شرط; and ſo, alſo, the propoſition compriſed in the relative clauſe of a given ſentence, is ſeldom repeated in the predicate or ſecond member of the ſame ſentence.

Yet the جزا is ſometimes found, in every Language, to conſiſt merely in the repetition of the شرط; as زید اگر نیامد نیامد "If Zyde is not come, why then he is not come;" and ſo, alſo, the predicate of a ſentence compriſing a relative clauſe is found, ſometimes, to conſiſt merely in the repetition of the relative clauſe; as "What has been, has been;" "What will be, will be;" and other examples of the ſame nature.

In this caſe, the hearer is probably ſuppoſed to expect, in the ſecond propoſition, or member of the ſentence, an explanation of the conſequences likely to reſult from the firſt; and if the expected conſequences, whether good or evil, ſhall not be likely to happen at all, the ſpeaker, in that caſe, will naturally enough adopt the form of conſtruction to which I

have

have adverted, in order, by the repetition of the جزا in the place of the شرط, to shew that the latter is wholly abortive; or in other words, that the former will be followed by no consequences of any kind.

I HAVE been seduced into this explanation (which may be thought too obvious to merit the attention of the reader,) from a desire to bring under his notice the not unfrequent occurrence of this form of construction, which is a favorite figure among the Persian Poets. It is most commonly employed by them, to indicate the unsubdued and forbearing patience with which a Persian lover submits to the unmerited pangs inflicted by the fair and capricious object of his vows. The following example shall here suffice.

برقِ عشق از خرمنِ پشمینه پوشی سوخت سوخت
جورِ شاهِ کامران گر بر گدائی رفت رفت
گر دلی از غمزهٔ دلدار باری برد برد
در میانِ جان و جانان ماجرائی رفت رفت   حافظ

THE very simplicity of these verses renders the translation a matter of difficulty; and I shall therefore transfer the task to the reader. It may be necessary, however, to apprize him that the word جان signifies *the lover*, or more literally *his soul*; and that the word جانان (His mistress) is a relative noun derived from جان. The particle که redundant, which is found in conversation to occur occasionally between the subject and the predicate of a given proposition, as فلان کتاب که حاضر است "Such a book is ready;" may be also observed to occur occasionally in writing, between the two members of a conditional sentence: as

هر سوخته جانی که به کشمیر درآید گر مرغ کباب است که با بال و پر آید   عرفی

 "Every

" Every parched creature that enters Kiſhmeer, even though a roaſted fowl, recovers there its wings and feathers." (Such is the ſalubrious climate of that happy country.)

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE little more to obſerve on the nature and application of Perſian verbs to the purpoſes of ſpeech. In treating of the uſe of tenſes, I have not found it neceſſary or expedient to aſſume as a principle of reference, the uſe of the correſponding tenſes of an Engliſh verb; *firſt*, becauſe the natural application of every tenſe muſt be the ſame in both (or to ſpeak more accurately) in all Languages: *ſecondly*, becauſe this natural application of tenſes is founded on ſelf-evident principles, ſuch as to admit of no illuſtration by the rules of grammar: *thirdly*, becauſe the accidental deviations from the order of nature, or in other words the uſe of one tenſe for another, conſtitutes, therefore, the only proper object of grammatical reſearch: *fourthly*, becauſe ſuch deviations are more eaſily diſcovered by referring to the order of nature itſelf, than to the arbitrary ſtandard of any given Language: *fifthly*, becauſe every deviation from the order of nature that may happen to occur in a given Language, if not wholly unaccountable, muſt admit of its true explanation without the leaſt reference to any other Tongue: *ſixthly*, becauſe it follows that the aid of a reference to the Engliſh or any other Language, though it might be occaſionally uſeful in the way of illuſtration, was not therefore by any means neceſſary to the accompliſhment of the object which I had in view: and *finally*, becauſe I have never had occaſion to conſider the rules that regulate the application of the tenſes of an Engliſh verb, and am therefore very imperfectly acquainted with the ſubject.

I OFFER theſe obſervations in order to guard the reader againſt a miſconception of the nature of my plan; for if it

were

were taken for granted that the application of the tenses of an English verb, and not the order of nature, had been assumed by me as the standard of reference, then the rules for the application of Persian tenses would seem, on that account, to be more imperfect than they are otherwise likely to be found. To explain by an example.

It is neither necessary, nor very practicable to illustrate by rule, the use of the simple past tense of the Persian verb comprised in the following example; because there is here no deviation from the order of nature, the past tense of the verb being employed, as it should be employed, to indicate the occurrence of a past event.

ای دریغا ای دریغا ای دریغ کان چنان ماهی نهان شد زیر میغ

"Alas! Alas! that such a moon as this *has been* hidden by the clouds."

Yet the example before us might be translated into English by means of another tense of the verb. "Alas! Alas! that such a moon as this *should be* hidden by the clouds;" and it seems to me that the *onus probandi* here rests with the English Grammarian, because the deviation (if any) from the order of nature is clearly on the side of our own Language. Accordingly, I am not quite sure that I understand the true meaning of the word "should" in this and other similar examples; but whatever may be its true meaning, I have already stated my opinion, that the discussion of the question falls to the lot of the writers on English Grammar, and I have no desire to encroach on their province.

It only remains to be remarked, that certain Arabic or Persian verbs, or perfect propositions, are sometimes used in the sense of nouns substantive or adjective; &c. as [illegible] and [illegible] *[illegible]*; شاباش for شاد باش *Praise* or *Appro-*

Approbation; دست مریزاد "May your hand never lose its powers!" now sometimes employed as a substantive noun to signify *Approbation;* کن مکن "Do and let alone;" *(Commands and Prohibitions;)* کشمکش *Difficulty;* لا یعلم "He does not know;" or *Ignorant;* لاابالی "I do not fear;" or *Fearless;* یعنی *It means;* or *Namely;* &c. &c. I now proceed to consider the application of PERSIAN PARTICLES to the purposes of speech.

OF PARTICLES.

CHAPTER FIRST.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

I HAVE already explained the ideas which I entertain of the true nature and use of particles, and am under no temptation to recur to the discussion of that abstracted and disputed point. It is enough to observe (and the remark will be deemed important by those who aim at the knowledge of truth) that though much of the accuracy of my reasoning may be overthrown, the existence and structure of the Arabic Language will still present an insuperable barrier against the admission of MR. TOOKE's principles on the broad basis of UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR. With the single exception of that Language, I shall grant all that MR. TOOKE can desire; I shall suppose that he has traced the particles of every other Tongue to their true origin as nouns or verbs. And having yielded this most liberal concession, I shall then shew that the Arabic Language abounds in letters (the servile letters) not significant in their own right, but merely in the right of some other word (as علم *Knowledge*) with which they must be therefore

invariably

invariably connected. Examples: عالم *Knowing;* معلوم *Known;* علام *Omniscient;* &c. &c.

The reader will easily perceive that these letters intersect the radical in all its points; and this intersection will prevent, for ever, the success of him who shall endeavour to prove that they were originally self significant words. For the choice of the proper *place* of intersection, as well as the choice of the proper letters, is obviously necessary to their significant character; and in the event of the occurrence of two or more letters in the same word, as معلوم *Known,* &c. they are often found to intersect the radical in *different* points.

It is obvious therefore, *first,* that these letters are not now significant in their own right; *secondly,* that they were never significant in their own right at any former period of time; and *finally,* that they are and always have been significant when combined with certain other words (as معلوم *Known,* Primitive علم *Knowledge;* مفهوم *Understood;* Primitive فهم *Understanding;* *&c.*) on which the significance of their character therefore depend.

Having thus established the conditional significance of these letters, it follows that I have *ipso facto* established a right to treat them as a certain species of words; and the question directly occurs, to what species of words they must be assigned? Now they cannot be assigned to the class of Nouns or Verbs, because Nouns and Verbs are self significant according to the opinion of every Grammarian; and they must be therefore assigned to the class of Particles, of which the characteristic is, that their significance depends on a certain combination. This fact being conceded to me, I shall very willingly grant in my turn that they form a very peculiar species of Particles, perhaps unknown to every other Tongue: but

then it is doubtless equally true, that of all imaginable particles they are the most artificial in their own nature, and consequently the most difficult of invention by a rude people. To admit the invention of these primary Particles, and to deny the probable invention of others that are less artificial in their own nature, appears to me, therefore, to be an inconsistency such as no fair reasoner will venture to maintain.

We must then suppose (which is very unphilosophical in my opinion) that the structure of the Arabic Language, if not inspired, is at least the result of premeditated reflexion; the work of the Learned in that country, prepared at some remote period of time, and submitted to the approbation of their countrymen, by whom it was adopted on the strength, merely, of its own merits; or we must admit that the most artificial, and in many respects the most admirable structure of Language that can be imagined, may and does owe its existence to the unpremeditated efforts of a rude people. For the excellence of the structure of the Arabic Language may be rendered obvious in a very few words, and that point once established, the conclusion I think must follow of course.

Let us suppose a body of learned Academicians assembled for the purpose of devising a system of Speech, at once simple in structure, and of a genius so admirably comprehensive as to provide, not merely for the expression of existing ideas, but even for the probable wants of future generations, through the endless revolution of a hundred centuries. Now I affirm that however visionary the scheme may appear, its object has been completely attained in the Arabic Language, which is provided, *first*, with an ample stock of words to express the ideas that exist in the Language; and, *secondly*, with means much more ample of expressing unborn ideas (if I may be permitted to use the expression) that have never yet been called into use.

For

For it is a well-known principle of the Language that every triliteral root has received a capacity to assume every possible form of inflexion; and those forms are multiplied to the number of three or four hundred, by the excellent and very artificial system of intersecting the radical in all its points.* But the possible inflexions of one word are precisely the same with those of another; and the simplicity of structure is therefore preserved to the very utmost practicable extent. Let us now suppose that the Arabic Roots or primitive nouns amount to the number of 4,000; and these multiplied by 300, the assumed number of possible inflexions, will yield a quotient of Twelve Hundred Thousand words, the forms of which, if they should be required, we can determine with as much certainty as if every one of them were now in use.

Now I imagine that One Hundred Thousand words may be assumed, as the greatest number that have ever been required or employed in any Language; but if we double that number (since the argument will admit of any concession) it still remains that there exist, in the Arabic Language, A Million of words that have never yet been called into use. Now I grant that these words are not significant, and are never likely to become so now; *first*, because the Language is already copious beyond the utmost limits of existing utility; *secondly*, because there is therefore occasion to diminish, not to increase, the rich vocabulary of existing terms; *thirdly*, because the significant inflexions of every word must be circumscribed by the nature of the idea which it is formed to denote; and, *finally*, because we cannot therefore derive a significant verb (for example) from a root which is not naturally or by sense the source of a verb.

* This intersection does not, as it might be suspected, generally occasion any difficulty in the discovery of the radical letters to a practised eye. There are examples, indeed, in which it is impossible to determine which are the radical, and which the servile letters; but these are by no means numerous, and generally speaking, the radical letters will be instantly recognized by any tolerable Arabic scholar. I have not counted the possible inflexions of an Arabic root, but I have no doubt that they amount to the number of at least 300, assumed in the text.

Hence

Hence it happens (to use the language of Richardson, borrowed, however, from the learned Meninski) that "some Arabic roots are significant in one form of inflexion, many in several, and none in all;" and the remark is not merely true in itself, but follows of necessity from the nature of things. Admitting its truth, which is beyond all question, it would yet be very absurd to infer that the principle by which every root is rendered susceptible of every possible form of inflexion, is therefore a mere refinement, of no apparent practical use: for, on the contrary, I do not hesitate to ascribe to the utility, grandeur, and (may I not say) the sublime philosophy of that principle, much of the systematic harmony of structure, brevity, force, and precision of expression, for which the Arabic Language may have been equalled, but never, I think, can be surpassed.

For what is the object or the consequence of such a principle, but that of ensuring, *first*, the existence in the Language of every imaginable significant inflexion that can be formed or required from a given root; and, *secondly*, of preserving, in the terms of Speech, an affinity similar to that which is found to exist in the nature of things? For if we examine the English, or any other Language in which the abovementioned principle does not operate, we shall be sure to find the affinity in question constantly violated; as in the case of a ship, a fleet, and a navy; three words of the same family, intimately connected together by sense, and utterly disjoined in point of etymology. Now it would be certainly more philosophical to have made ship the root of the other two, than it is to have recourse to the very inartificial system which we have adopted on this and other similar occasions; yet it must be admitted that the three words in question *exist* in the Language; and, though utterly unconnected in point of etymology, they are not certainly, on that account, the less applicable to every practical purpose of speech.

But

But though these three words exist in the Language, are we quite certain that the same fact is universally true of other words? that the Language is not deficient in terms required to express a given PRIMITIVE, of which the derivative is of common occurrence; or a given DERIVATIVE, of which the primitive is of common use? If the question were put to an Arab, with reference to his own Language, he might return the following satisfactory answer. "Our Language has provided systematically against the occurrence of all such accidents; *first*, because our primitives are, generally speaking, *substantive* nouns, which are the true materials of Language; the source, in short, to which verbs, adjectives, epithets, participles, and other derivatives of every species must be ultimately referred; *secondly*, because we have rendered every primitive or substantive noun susceptible of every possible form of inflexion, by which it may be easily converted into the form of any given derivative that may be required, such as a participle, a verb, or an adjective noun; &c. *thirdly*, because we have already formed, according to this principle, all the derivatives of every species that have been hitherto actually required in the Language; and *finally*, because the same principle will enable us to form an endless variety of new derivatives, never hitherto called into use, if these should happen to be required hereafter." *

If the same question were put to an Englishman, he must be compelled to admit; *first*, that the English Language has not provided systematically against the occurrence of such

* I AM well persuaded, that the Arab writers are not unfrequently found to invent *new* significant forms of inflexion, according to the principle stated in the text; and the MUCKAMAUTE HUREEREE and other books, will furnish many examples of their occurrence. For the established significant inflexions of every ROOT are, or ought to be recorded in every Arabic Lexicon; but the author of the MUCKAMAUTE HUREEREE, has employed many significant forms of inflexions that are not to be found in any Lexicon. I conclude, therefore, that the significance of those inflexions has no other foundation than that of the authority of the author in question. They are, however, easily intelligible on reference to the established significance of the ROOTS from which they are derived.

accidents as thefe; and, *fecondly*, that fuch accidents are obvioufly of common occurrence in the Language; as in the cafe of OBLONG, which has no correfponding fubftantive noun (OBLONGALITY;) or OBLOQUY, from which, though plainly by fenfe the fource of an adjective, no legitimate adjective can be derived. It is needlefs to multiply the examples of this nature, which will occur in abundance to every man who will take the trouble to turn over the leaves of an Englifh Dictionary; and I fhall merely obferve, that the deficiency of our Language in this refpect, is the neceffary fource of many circumlocutions, fuch as an Arab will feldom or never have occafion to employ.

THE preceding obfervations are quite fufficient to eftablifh the artificial ftructure of the Arabic Language, not merely in the formation of DERIVATIVES, but even in the formation of PRIMITIVE NOUNS. For if there were no properties common to all the primitive nouns of the Language, it would be plainly impoffible to fubject them all to the very fame forms of inflexion; and hence it happens, that every primitive noun is found to poffefs at leaft *three* radical letters; this being a property common to them all, which is clearly an effect of deliberate ART.* I fay, therefore, that the ufe of ART is coeval

* The reader knows, that fome Arabic roots poffefs *four*, or even *five* radical letters; but the tri'iteral roots are by far the moft numerous in the Arabic Language, and to thefe, only, the obfervations in the text are to be confidered as applicable in their full extent. A quadriliteral root admits of many forms of inflexion; of more, indeed, than belong to the words of any other Tongue; yet the poffible inflexions of a quadriliteral root are much lefs numerous than thofe of the triliteral clafs, which are fufceptible (as in the cafe of the word (فعل) of every exifting form of inflexion. A quinqueliteral root has very little variety of inflexion, but then it is generally the name of a *fubftance*, from which (for reafons often mentioned in the courfe of this work) few fignificant inflexions can be derived. I fhall take this opportunity of ftating, that there are *anomalies*, in the ARABIC as in every other Language; and if, in the courfe of the prefent difcuffion, I have not thought it neceffary to advert to thefe, it is merely becaufe their occafional occurrence cannot poffibly affect the exiftence of thofe general principles, by which the artificial ftructure of the ARABIC Language is eftablifhed on a bafis never to be fhaken.

with

with the ſtructure of the Arabic Language; or, in other words, that there is no imaginable proceſs of the mind, by which the Language can be traced back to a rude, uncultivated and ſimple ſtate, in which the general principles of its formation were leſs artificial than they are now.

Yet though the Arabic and the Hebrew are but different dialects of the ſame Language, I ſee no ſufficient reaſon to admit the inſpiration of either Tongue; *firſt*, becauſe the inſpiration of any Language is a fact not to be admitted, except on the clear evidence of divine revelation, ſuch as in the preſent caſe we do not poſſeſs, and are not likely ever to obtain; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe, with all the excellence of its general principles, there are ſome remarkable defects in the Language, ſuch as the intricate formation of the plural number, that ſeem to indicate the imperfect ſtructure of a ſyſtem otherwiſe poſſeſſing, in my judgment, the higheſt claims to intellectual pre-eminence over every other Tongue. And I am ſtill leſs diſpoſed to believe that the Arabic, or any other human Language, is the work of Philoſophers; *firſt*, becauſe there are no Philoſophers in the infancy of Language; and *ſecondly*, becauſe the influence of Philoſophers, when they did exiſt, would be inſufficient to effect the ſubverſion of the Language previouſly eſtabliſhed in the country.

It remains therefore that the Arabic Language, with all its artifice, has ariſen, like other Tongues, out of the fortuitous wants of the people who ſpeak it; and we ſhould next enquire how it came to paſs that a ſyſtem apparently founded on the moſt profound ſpeculations of Philoſophy has been, as it were, the reſult of accident; the fortuitous conſequence of unpremeditated thought!! This, however, is a ſubject on which I feel my inability to enlarge with any reaſonable proſpect of ſucceſs; and I ſhall therefore merely venture to ſtate an opinion in which the reader will probably concur;

namely,

namely, that we are naturally to look for excellence of ſtructure in what has been termed the PRIMITIVE TONGUES.

IN a patch work Language, ſuch as the Engliſh, the unity of principle muſt be greatly impaired; becauſe the reſources of the Language are neceſſarily drawn from the incongruous ſtructure of many other Tongues formed on various or oppoſite principles. There can be nothing common to all the Languages that enter into the compoſition of the Engliſh Tongue; and there muſt be much awkwardneſs in endeavouring to bend to the inflexions of one Language, the words originally deſigned for ſo many others. The powers of inflexion are accordingly more circumſcribed in our Language, than they are found to be in moſt other Tongues; and the reaſon will be obvious to thoſe who conſider, *firſt*, that we have not multiplied the powers of inflexion by the ſyſtem of *interſecting* the radical in all its points; *ſecondly*, that our inflexions are therefore formed on the more limited ſcheme of adding to the radical certain terminations; as BURN-*ing;* BURN-*eth;* BURN-*ed;* &c. *thirdly*, that the terminations borrowed from one Language, are often awkwardly applicable to the words derived from ſeveral other Tongues; and, *finally*, that this awkwardneſs often prevents the employment of many forms of inflexion that would be otherwiſe of univerſal application in the Language; as in the caſe of PALATABLE, from which very few writers would chuſe to form PALATABILITY, or PALATABLENESS, though the Grammatical accuracy of theſe nouns cannot, I think, be reaſonably diſputed.

ON the other hand, the unity of deſign will be ſeldom violated in the progreſs of any primitive Tongue; becauſe the ſucceſſive inventors of ſuch a Tongue, happily ignorant of every foreign ſyſtem of Speech, will be neceſſarily impelled, by the principle of imitation, to copy, in every practicable caſe, the eſtabliſhed uſage of their *own* Language. They

will

will not, except in cafes of urgent neceffity, have recourfe to the adoption of new principles; and every new principle that may be adopted, will form a rule for the guidance of all future inventors. The Language, advancing in its progrefs to maturity, may extend indefinitely the number of its words; but thefe, being formed in every practicable cafe with reference to the fame common and previoufly received principles, will ferve merely to augment their influence. The whole ftructure of the Language will thus inevitably affume a fyftematic and harmonious form of arrangement, in which every thing appears to be the refult of premeditated thought and reflexion; whereas, in point of fact, it is nothing more than the neceffary and natural confequence of the principle of imitation, operating with unlimited and uniform influence on the minds of inventors ignorant of every foreign fyftem of Speech, and therefore compelled, by a happy neceffity, to fhape their inventions to one common mould.*

These obfervations may ferve to account for much of that harmony of ftructure (if in point of fact it has any exiftence) which I have ventured, by conjecture, to afcribe to *all* the primitive Tongues; but if we compare one primitive Tongue with another, it will probably appear that

* It follows, from what has been faid in the text, that the influx of foreigners is likely to injure the purity of a primitive Tongue; becaufe, though they may doubtlefs enrich it by an acceffion of new terms fignificant of ideas previoufly unknown to the people among whom they refide, yet thofe terms, being neceffarily formed in a foreign mould, will be untractable to the general principles of the Language, and will deftroy the harmony of ftructure altogether, if they fhall happen to bear any confiderable proportion of number to the previoufly exifting terms of Speech. Accordingly the Arabs, who are by no means ambitious of introducing foreign idioms into their Language, though they have not been able wholly to avoid them, have reforted for the ftandard of its purity, not like Europeans to courts and cities, but to the heart of the Desert, where the Language is neceffarily of greater purity, becaufe lefs intermixed with foreign idioms. It may be inferred from many fources of intelligence, that the poets and orators of Arabia were commonly accuftomed to repair for inftruction to the wandering tribes that inhabit the Defert.

ſome are formed on very ſimple principles, while others, ſuch as the Arabic, and as I have been told, the Sanſkrit alſo, evince the utmoſt poſſible artifice of ſtructure that can be imagined to exiſt in a Language. I know not how to account for this fact otherwiſe than by adverting to another; *namely*, that ſince the general ſtructure of one Language is often found to be wholly different from that of another, it ſeems to follow, as a matter of neceſſity, that they *muſt* be diſtinguiſhed from each other by the ſimplicity or the artifice peculiar to each. For I can perceive no probable reaſon why two Languages, originally formed on different principles, ſhould poſſeſs preciſely the ſame degree of art; nor any reaſon, in the preſent ſtate of exiſting Tongues, why we may not as well hope to diſcover the celebrated region of golden EL DORADO, as that imaginary primitive Tongue, once ſpoken by all mankind, which has been ſuppoſed, by ſome philoſophers, to form the common baſis of all the reſt.

ADMITTING, therefore, the various ſtructure of various Tongues, it may be expected that ſome will be more artificial than others; and the Arabic Language, formed on thoſe comprehenſive principles which I have endeavoured very ſhortly to explain, has furniſhed an illuſtrious example of the extent to which ART may be carried, in the very infancy of a primitive Tongue. For I have clearly proved that ART, in this Language, extends its influence even to the formation of primitive nouns, a fact from which it may be certainly inferred that "the uſe of art is literally COEVAL, or very nearly coeval with the exiſtence of the Language, and that the latter muſt abſolutely ceaſe to exiſt before it will ceaſe to evince the traces of art."

HAVING thus proved the artificial ſtructure of the Arabic Language, it remains to apply the argument by analogy to the probable employment of deliberate ART in the formation of other more ſimple Tongues. Now the argument by analogy is

obviouſly

obviously as strong as the nature of such an argument will admit; because it reasons from a known fact, *namely*, the highly artificial structure of our Language, to the probable employment of *some portion* of art, in the structure of others that are less artificial. And though the structure of the English Language is unquestionably less artificial than that of most other Tongues, I shall venture, even here, to brave the extent of Mr. TOOKE's discoveries, in stating my opinion that the Language does in fact manifest the most obvious marks of deliberate art, in the inflexions of many of our nouns and verbs; as GIVE and GAVE; GET and GOT; HEAT and HOT; FIGHT and FOUGHT; SHAKE and SHOOK; FALL and FELL; MAN and MEN; &c. &c.

FOR GOT is plainly an inflexion of GET, and MEN is plainly an inflexion of MAN; and though I admit the bare possibility of tracing those inflexions to some corrupted source, by the means of etymology, according to the principles established by Mr. TOOKE, I am very clearly of opinion that the operations of etymology, often uncertain and perhaps erroneous, carried on too amidst the rust and obscurity of musty antiquity, and necessarily directed to the investigation of principles through the endless and very fallible medium of tracing the source of every single word, are, in their own nature, too unwieldy, and (which is of more consequence) are founded on a basis much too narrow, to warrant the establishment, on such a foundation, of any one principle of grammatical science.

ACCORDINGLY, I am not aware that any such principle, at once new and of probable authenticity, has been established by the result of Mr. TOOKE's enquiries; for, though the accuracy of his etymology is admitted to be unquestionable, or at least cannot be questioned by me who am utterly unqualified for such an undertaking, I am yet warranted, by the arguments often employed in the course

of

of this work, to reject entirely, on the basis of Universal Grammar, those two leading and conspicuous principles by which he would banish from words the fluctuations of sense, and from Language the use of deliberate art!

But such principles are not likely to be universally applicable to *any one* Language, unless they are equally applicable to *all*; and hence it follows that the accuracy of their application to the English Tongue cannot be conceded to the force of an argument founded merely on the inference of analogy from partial evidence. Mr. Tooke may prove, but cannot possibly be suffered to assume, on defective evidence, a principle so incredible as that by which he affirms that the same English word or sound denotes invariably the same idea in every example that can be adduced; and he must also prove (since the argument by analogy is obviously insufficient to establish the *probability* of such a fact) the utter absence of deliberate art from the structure of every individual English word, (as MAN and MEN; SHAKE and SHOOK; GET and GOT; &c. &c.) that may be offered, by his adversaries, as an exercise for the display of his Etymological skill.

It is obvious to observe the extent to which those proofs must be carried, before the absence of deliberate art can be certainly affirmed of the structure, even, of the English Language; the most favorable of any, by reason of its general simplicity of structure, for the successful issue of such an experiment. They would infallibly extend through many weary volumes of tasteless Etymology, open to the suspicion of numerous errors, and likely to escape criticism, only because the intolerable severity of such a study would repel the industry of almost every reader. So fallible, so very unwieldy, so utterly defective, according to my judgment, is the science of Etymology, considered as

a means to investigate the nature and general principles of Speech! *

* I admit the utility of Mr. Tooke's Etymology, and should refer to his book, in preference to every other source of intelligence, for the meaning and history of many individual English words; or indeed of every English or Foreign word which he has explained in the course of his work. As a Grammarian, too, I have the highest respect for Mr. Tooke's talents, but none at all for his favorite science of Etymology, considered as a guide to the establishment of general Grammatical truth. For it should never be forgotten, that the truths of General Grammar are Necessary and Immutable by their own nature, whereas the truths of Etymology are merely Fortuitous, and therefore radically unfit to furnish Data for the establishment of any one principle of General Grammar. I shall suppose, for Example, that a given Etymological truth as the identity of the demonstrative that, (Give me that book), and the conjunction that (I would have you to believe that I would not hurt a fly; or I would not hurt a fly, I would have you to believe that;) has been established, by unexceptionable evidence, as well in the English, as in every other Tongue. Shall it be therefore maintained, that this identity is Necessary or Immutable by its own nature? or shall we not rather admit that the fact, though *proved* to be true of every existing Language, is obviously Fortuitous by its own nature? In my opinion, it is clearly Fortuitous, and for this plain reason, *namely*, because it is possible to conceive the existence of some *future* Language, in which the demonstrative that shall be expressed by *one* word, and the conjunctive that shall be expressed by *another* which is neither a Demonstrative, nor an Article, nor a Pronoun, nor in short any thing else but a *mere* Conjunction.

This consideration would be alone sufficient to destroy the Necessity of the identity in question, though that identity were clearly established by unexceptionable evidence, in the case of every existing Language. But if the identity be not necessary, it must be Fortuitous, and that which is fortuitous is not a principle of Universal Grammar, which deals only in Necessary truth. It remains therefore, that the identity of the conjunctive that, and the demonstrative that, is not a principle of Universal Grammar, even according to the liberal admission that it is positively true of every Language existing on Earth. But that which is Fortuitous is not likely to be positively true of every Language existing on Earth, and if I have made the admission, it is merely for the sake of argument, because I had no occasion to call in question the accuracy of Mr. Tooke's opinion, who does not hesitate to aver its truth of all the Languages that now exist. (See Diversions of Purley, Vol. 1st, Page 86.) The occasion however will shortly occur, and since I am not bound to prove a negative, I shall then call on Mr. Tooke for evidence to shew the Pronominal character of the Persian Conjunctive ﺲ That. In the mean time, I desire the reader to keep in mind the Necessary and Immutable nature of the truths of General Grammar, and then to point out if he can, any one truth of this nature, for which the world is indebted to the Diversions of Purley. It would be in the highest degree uncandid not to admit that the work abounds in useful Fortuitous truths, which may be accurately applicable to many Languages, though they are not probably applicable to all.

I HAVE now ſhown, *firſt*, the highly artificial ſtructure of the Arabic Language; and *ſecondly*, the inſufficiency of the evidence hitherto furniſhed, to prove the abſence of deliberate art in the ſtructure of our own more ſimple Tongue. I am authoriſed, therefore, to aſſume the uſe of DELIBERATE ART as a principle applicable to the formation of Language; and to build, if poſſible, on that principle, an argument for the probable invention of primitive particles that were not originally verbs or nouns. Now the ART neceſſary to the invention of primitive particles conſtitutes, I think, the corner ſtone of the argument againſt the probability of their invention by a rude people; for if it were as eaſy to invent a primitive particle, as it is to invent a verb or a noun, it would be quite impoſſible to aſſign any plauſible reaſon why thoſe who have unqueſtionably invented the one, might not have invented the other alſo.

ACCORDINGLY, I have already erected, on the baſis of the artificial ſtructure of the Arabic Language, an argument by analogy for the probable exiſtence of primitive particles of every ſpecies, as well in the Engliſh, as in every other Tongue; and have now only to refer the reader to that part of the introductory chapter to this volume, (PAGE 29,) which treats of particles, as contradiſtinguiſhed from nouns and verbs.

IN cloſing theſe deſultory obſervations, I think it neceſſary to remark, that MR. HARRIS unqueſtionably underſtood the true nature of PARTICLES, which he ſomewhere ſtates to be CONSIGNIFICANT WORDS. The errors of his definition (that PARTICLES have no ſignificance at all) cannot be defended, but thoſe who read with candor, will recogniſe the accuracy of his ideas on the ſubject, and will condemn nothing but the careleſs inaccuracy of the terms in which his ideas are ſometimes conveyed.

I NOW proceed to conſider, individually, the particles employed in the Perſian Language.

CHAPTER SECOND.

OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CERTAIN LETTERS OF THE ALPHABET.

There are ſixteen letters of the Perſian Alphabet, namely, ا ; ب ; ت ; چ ; د ; ز ; س ; ش ; ـت ; ک ; ل ; م ; ن ; و ; ه ; ی ; that are found to aſſume occaſionally a ſignificant character. In this point of view, moſt of them are clearly particles, though ſome, as the conjunctive pronouns ت , م and ش , are apparently ſelf-ſignificant, and therefore not to be aſſigned to the claſs of particles. With the exception of س , ـت and ل , excluſively applicable to Arabic words, and therefore of little importance to the Perſian ſtudent, I propoſe, in this chapter, to determine as nearly as poſſible, the ſignificant character of each letter; and the uſes to which it may be applied. The reader will remember the difficulty incident to the nature of the ſubject, and will pardon the errors into which I may be led, without rejecting, on account of theſe, the general arguments by which I have endeavoured to eſtabliſh in Language, the exiſtence of primitive particles as contra-diſtinguiſhed from nouns or verbs. For the meaning of the particle ـ, for example, may be not improbably miſtaken by me; but it would be very unreaſonable to found on ſuch a miſtake, an inference to prove that *all* particles muſt have been formerly verbs or nouns.

On the contrary, the accuracy of the general arguments by which I have endeavoured to establish the reverſe of that propoſition would remain unſhaken, though it were proved againſt me, that I had miſtaken the meaning of every individual particle in the Perſian Language; and though I do not apprehend that my errors are likely to extend ſo far, I am too conſcious of the difficulties in the way of him who undertakes to determine the ſenſe of primitive particles, not to apprehend that

I

I may be led into error. I think it neceſſary, therefore, to enter, *à priori*, my proteſt againſt every inference, founded on this inadmiſſible baſis, that may be formed in prejudice to thoſe general arguments, by which I have endeavoured to eſtabliſh the exiſtence of primitive particles. I ſhall now proceed to explain the uſe of the letter Alif; and, for the ſake of convenience, will offer ſuch obſervations as occur on the ſubject, in the form of detached and general rules.

SECTION FIRST.

RULE FIRST.

This letter may be accurately prefixed to certain particles comprizing two letters; as ابا or با *With*; ابر or بر *On*; ابی or بی *Without*; &c. And in this caſe, it receives invariably the vowel *Futha*, having no effect on the ſenſe of the word to which it is prefixed. Example: ترک روز آمد ابا زرین سپر "The ſoldier of day (the Sun) advanced with his ſhield of gold;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

It is often prefixed, without affecting the ſenſe, to certain Perſian words of three or more letters; receiving, in that caſe, the vowel point originally applicable to the firſt letter, which is then rendered quieſcent. Examples: اشگرف for شگرف *Excellent*; اشکم or شکم *The belly*; اشتر or شتر *A camel*; &c. According to the opinion of many Grammarians, the inſertion of *Alif* is here (and ſo alſo of the caſe ſtated in the firſt rule) a mark of the Duree Dialect, as oppoſed to the Dialect of Persia Proper, in which the letter *Alif* was commonly omitted. Be that as it may, the omiſſion of *Alif* now generally prevails in the Language; and its inſertion is of rare occurrence, except in the works of the earlier Poets.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

In the middle of a word, the letter Alif is commonly employed to convert the third person singular of the Aorist, into what may be termed the Precative form of the verb; as بُوَاد or بَاد "May he or it be;" رَوَاد "May he or it "go;" مَرَوَاد "May it not go;" &c. And it sometimes occurs, for the same purpose, before the letter م of the first person singular. Example: بُوسِی بِدِه اَی شَمْع کِه دَر پَای تُو مِیرَام "Give me a kiss, O my beloved; that I may die at your "feet!" &c. It may be reckoned a pleonasm in خُوَار for خُور *The sun;* غَمْخُوَار for غَمْخُور *Dispelling grief;* نِگُونْسَار for نِگُونْسَر *Inverted*; &c. &c.

RULE FOURTH.

Between two nouns, it seems to indicate the relation of Conjunction; and must, in this case, be variously translated, according to the examples in which it may happen to occur. Examples: سَرَاسَر "From one end to the other;" سَرَاپَا "From head to foot;" دَمَادَم "At every instant;" دُوشَادُوش "Side by side;" شَبَاشَب "Every night;" شَبَارُوز "Night and day;" زُورَازُور "Hastily;" پَیَاپَی "Successively;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

At the end of the past or present tenses of a Persian verb, the letter Alif, then termed اَلِف اِشْبَاع, may be reckoned a pleonasm; being introduced by the poets, for the apparent purpose of filling up the measure of an otherwise defective verse. Examples: گُفْتَم کِه بِیمَار تُو اَم گُفْتَا نَخَوَاید زِیسْت اِین "I said, I am sick of love for thee; and she replied, this man will not live!" دُو رُوز و دُو شَب رُوی نَنْمَایَدَا "It (the Moon) "continues invisible for two days;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

At the end of a noun, it may be sometimes a pleonasm; as زمین پوشد از نور پیرایها "The earth assumes a garment of "light;" توشا درویشا کو را بود عیش تن آسانی "Happy is the poor man who enjoys personal ease;" &c.* But here the letter Alif is also employed for many useful purposes of speech, most of which are known to the reader; as, *First*, to form the vocative case: یارا "O my beloved!" بلبلا "O Night-"ingale!" حسرتا "O the pity!" &c. *Secondly*, to form attributives from the Hasile Musder in the third class: (See Volume First, Page 411;) as کوشا "A laborer;" روا "Current;" &c. *Thirdly*, to form the Hasile Musder of the seventh class, when added to the end of certain attributives: as درازا "Length;" ژرفا "Depth;" فراخا "Spacious-"ness;" &c. *Fourthly*, to form a sort of Intensive Superlative: (not the vocative in all probability, since the vocative particle may be here superadded;) as خوشا "Very hap-"py;" ای خوشا "O most happy!" بسا "Very much;" or "Very many;" ای بسا "O there are many!" &c. And, *finally*, to form, though rarely, what has been generally considered as a species of the Diminutive noun; though I am rather disposed to consider it as a pleonasm: as بازاریا from بازاری "A frequenter of the market;" &c. When added to the end of an Arabic noun, this letter forms the Objective Case, and the noun generally assumes the sense of an adverb: as اتفاقا "By chance;" حقا "In truth;" مثلا "For example;" &c. &c.

CONCLUSION.

It only remains to be remarked, that the letter Alif is not unfrequently found to assume the sound of Wao

---

* I suppose the letter *Alif* to be a pleonasm in the word درویشا for درویشی here used as a relative noun to signify "One of the sect or tribe of Durveishes."

MAAROOF: as کِه گرَم بتیغ زَنِی بَندَهٔ فَرمای تو اَم "For if you slay "me with a ſword, I ſubmit to your will;" &c. The word فَرمای is here pronounced فَرمُوی, to rhyme with رُوی; مُوی; &c. which occur in the other verſes of the poem. The ſtraight Grecian noſe, or the upright form of a Perſian beauty, is often compared with the letter ALIF, the form of which is nearly ſtraight. I now proceed to determine, as nearly as I am able, the ſignificant character of the letter ب.

SECTION SECOND.

ب

THE letter ب, as a particle, is indifferently applicable to nouns or verbs; receiving, in either caſe, the vowel points to be ſpecified in a ſubſequent part of this chapter. As a prepoſition, this letter is of courſe excluſively applicable to nouns; and is found, in this character, to indicate a conſiderable number of *ſpecific* relations, ſome of which are more or leſs obviouſly diſtinguiſhed from others. Now I would not be underſtood to affirm, that the letter ب has therefore any fluctuations of ſenſe; becauſe, on the contrary, I am diſpoſed to believe, that this letter denotes ſome *general* relation (as that of APPOSITION or CONJUNCTION for example,) under which all the ſpecific relations to which I have adverted, may, perhaps, be accurately and reaſonably compriſed. But admitting this fact, it may yet be uſeful to point out the nature of thoſe *ſpecific* relations which the letter ب is found to expreſs, and to determine the difference exiſting between them; for if the relation ſignified by that letter, be of a *general* nature, it will be therefore applicable, (like the word *animal* among nouns,) to a great variety of ſpecific relations; and theſe may differ from each other as one animal differs from another; as a *horſe*, in ſhort, differs from a *man*. For though the term ANIMAL is doubtleſs applicable to a MAN or a HORSE, it is utterly incompetent to determine the ſpecific difference between them; and ſo, alſo, if it be true that the letter ب denotes the

general

general relation of CONJUNCTION, (in other words that it may be every where tranflated by the word JOIN,) it ftill remains to determine, by adverting to the common ufage of the Language, the nature of thofe *fpecific* relations that may be accurately comprifed under that very indefinite and general term. But the gradations of diftinction between various relations, expreffed in Language by the fame general term, are often exceedingly fubtile and refined; infomuch, that it is difficult to form any claffification of thefe, that will not be open to many exceptions. For my part, I fhall diftinguifh only the moft obvious relations, including, in the fame clafs, all thofe that approach fo nearly together in their own nature, as to render the diftinction between them doubtful or obfcure.

RULE FIRST.

THE PROPER and the IMPROPER ZURF, as explained in CHAPTER FIRST, PAGE 122, of this Volume, may be accurately governed by the prepofition بہ; which denotes, in this cafe, the relation known by the term ظرفیت; or that relation which exifts between the verb, and the noun fignificant of a given *time*, *place*, or *receptacle*, in which the action of the verb may happen to occur. Examples: دعا کن بشب "Pray in the night;" بخانه بنشین "Sit down in the houfe;" بفکر فرو رفتم "I was loft in thought;" ببلا گرفتار شدم "I was involved in mifery;" &c. The two laft furnifh examples of the IMPROPER ZURF; fince the words "thought" and "mifery," though not properly the names of any given time, place, or receptacle, are here metaphorically confidered by the mind, as a *labyrinth* or *receptacle*, in the mazes of which the fpeaker is loft.

RULE SECOND.

THE prepofition بہ may be accurately employed to denote the relation of APPROXIMATION to place or perfons, known in Grammar by the terms قرب و اتصال.

Examples:

Examples: رفتم به طبیب or, which is the same thing, نزد طبیب رفتم "I went to the doctor;" ازین جا به آنجا رفتم or, which is the same thing, ازین جا تا آنجا رفتم "I went from hence to such a place;" &c."

RULE THIRD.

It may be accurately employed to denote the relation of Association, known in Grammar by the term معیّت or مصاحبت: as به مردم درآمیز, or, which is the same thing, با مردم درآمیز "Mix with mankind;" &c. It seems to indicate the same relation, when applied to the second object of certain transitive verbs: as گفتن ; فرمودن ; بخشودن ; &c. Examples: بدو گفتم; or او را گفتم; or با او گفتم و فرمودم; "I spoke with him," or "Said to him;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It may be accurately employed to indicate the relation known by the term استعانت "Demanding assistance;" and very commonly governs, in this case, the name of the Instrument employed in the performance of a given action. Examples: بتیغ بریدم "I cut with a sword;" بقلم نوشتم. "I wrote with a pen;" کشتی بکرشمهٔ جهانی "She would slay with a glance a world of lovers;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

It seems to indicate the same relation, when employed, at the beginning of a book, to govern the name of the Deity; &c. And, in this case, the verb آغاز می‌کنم "I begin this book," or any other words to the same effect, must be supplied in order to complete the structure of the sentence. Example:

بنام آن که هستی نام از و یافت "In the name of HIM who gave name to exiſtence," (I begin this book) &c. And ſo, alſo, when employed elſewhere for the purpoſe of ADJURATION; as به لبیک حجاج بیت الحرام "I adjure you by the word لبیک (I AM twice prepared to attend you) uttered by thoſe who undertake the pilgrimage to the holy Temple;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

IT may accurately govern any given ſubſtantive noun ſignificant of the thing by which we ſwear; and, in this caſe alſo, the verb is generally underſtood in the ſentence. Example: بسرت گر همه عالم بسرم جمع شوند "I ſwear by your head, that though all the world ſhould conſpire againſt me for the purpoſe;" نتوانند برد هوای تو برون از سر ما "They will never be able to eradicate the love which I bear to you." In this caſe, the particle به is ſometimes omitted; and muſt be ſupplied by the underſtanding of the reader: as جان شما و سر شما چنان کنم "I ſwear by your life or your head, that I will do ſo and ſo;" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

IT may be accurately employed to denote the relation of CAUSATION, known in Grammar by the term سببیت. Examples: آبادی مملکت بانصاف است "The proſperity of a country depends on the practiſe of juſtice;" or "is obtained by reaſon of the practice of juſtice;" ولی به بخت من امشب سحر نمی آید "But by reaſon of my evil fortune, this night will never come to an end;" &c. It may alſo indicate the relation ſignified by the terms غایت و غرض; and governs, in this caſe, the noun employed to indicate the END OR PURPOSE for which a given action is to be performed. Example ای دوست به پرسیدن حافظ قدمی نه "Come, O my beloved, for the purpoſe of enquiring into

the condition of Hafiz!" This is obviously a different relation from that signified by the term سببیت, though both may be accurately translated by the general term Causation.

RULE EIGHTH.

It may be accurately employed to indicate the relation signified by the term تقابل or Opposition; as اسپی بزر خریدم و فروختم "I purchased or sold a horse for money;" and the relation signified by the term بدل or Exchange; as بشادی رخ گل بیخ غم ز دل برکن "In exchange or in recompense for the joy inspired by the blooming rose, banish, I pray you, the anguish of care;" &c. These two relations approach very nearly together in their own nature, and for aught I know, may, perhaps, be exactly the same.

RULE NINTH.

It may be accurately employed to indicate the relation signified by the term استعلا Heighth or Exaltation; and is synonimous, in this case, with the preposition بر On. Example: بکوهش زد, or which is the same thing, برکوهش زد "He beat him against a hill, or on a hill;" &c. The relation of Equality, signified by the term مساوات, is also expressed by the preposition بر: as بحسن و صورت او بر زمین نخواهد بود "There is nobody on earth, equal to him in beauty and gracefulness of form;" بسوز زکه بر من به برگ کاهی نیست "Let it (the harvest of my life) burn; for in my estimation it is not worth a straw; or equal in value to a straw;" &c. The preposition به is also found occasionally to signify according to; as پس بکام دوستان مغزش برار "And then put out his brains, according to the wishes of your friends;" &c.

RULE

RULE TENTH.

It may be considered as a PLEONASM, before the words جز and بجز; as بجز ; بغیر ; "Besides or Except;" and before a noun followed by the prepositions در ; بر ; اندر ; as بدریا در "In the sea or the river;" بآب اندر "In the water;" بسر بر "On my head;" &c. Example: بسر بر کلاه مهی داشتم "I had on my head the crown of royalty;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

The Persian PARTICLE بَ, followed by a noun, is invariably moveable by the vowel *Futha;* but there is an Arabic PARTICLE بِ, having the same or nearly the same sense, which is invariably moveable by the vowel *Kusra:* as باللّٰه "By God;" بسم اللّٰه "In the name of God;" &c. The particle بِ, before a verb, may be often a PLEONASM; though sometimes employed to restrict the AORIST to future time, as stated in RULE NINTH, PAGE 338, of this Volume. Before a verb, this particle receives invariably the vowel *Kusra;* or at least, may accurately receive that vowel point, in every example that can be adduced: as بیار ; برفت ; برو ; بیابن ; &c. Yet MOWALANA SOOROOREE, the author of an Arabic commentary on the GOOLISTAUN, has authorised the use of the vowel *Zumma; first,* when that vowel point shall be applicable to the first letter of the verb: as بمرد ; بیابن ; &c. and *secondly,* when the verb shall have the labials با , فا , میم , or واو for the first letter: as بپالید ; بفرماید ; بفرمود ; ببین ; بپاید ; بمال ; بورزید ; بورزد ; &c. I am of opinion that the accuracy of the vowel *Zumma* depends on the authority of prescription alone; whereas the vowel *Kusra* is always accurate, and therefore preferable as a rule for the guidance of those who study the Language in a foreign country. I now proceed to consider the significant character of various letters, included together in one Section, because there is not much to be said of each.

SECTION

SECTION THIRD.

ت چ د ز ژ س ش ف

ت

THERE is nothing to be obſerved of the letter ت, which forms a CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUN of the ſecond perſon; and, in that character, has already been the ſubject of diſcuſſion in CHAPTER FIRST, PAGE 66, of this Volume. It is found ſometimes to be a mere pleonaſm at the end of a word: as بالش or بالشت *A pillow*; &c.

چ

THIS letter, moveable by the vowel *Kuſra*, is employed, *firſt*, as a RELATIVE: as چه باشد میسّر بزودی بفرست "Whatever is prepared bring it quickly;" *ſecondly*, as an INTERROGATIVE: as چه میگوئی "What do you ſay?" And, *finally*, (when moveable by the vowel *Futha*,) as a termination to form the DIMINUTIVE NOUN: as زاغچه; *A ſmall crow*; باغچه *A ſmall garden*; &c. &c. In each of theſe characters, it has been the ſubject of former diſcuſſion, and need not, therefore, now occupy the attention of the reader.

دال

THIS letter is the ſign of the third perſon ſingular of the preſent tenſe of a Perſian verb; and in that character, has been held, by moſt Grammarians, to be a ſort of pronominal nominative to the verb: as برود; بدهد; &c. &c. It is not unfrequently employed by the poets, as a ſort of metaphorical name for the *curling locks* of a beautiful lady; though the compariſon, it muſt be admitted, has a great deal more of abſurdity than truth.

ز

THIS letter has no significance, except as a contraction for از *From*, which will be treated in a subsequent Chapter of this Work.

ژ

THIS letter, moveable by the vowel *Futha*, and therefore followed by یاي مخفف or *the gentle aspirate*, is employed as a termination to form the DIMINUTIVE NOUN; and, in that character, has already been noticed in VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 437 of this Work; as نایژه *The throat;* or *A small reed;* &c.

س

THIS letter is employed to restrict an Arabic verb in the AORIST, to what may be termed the PROXIMATE FUTURE, and may be accurately translated by the word SOON: as ينصر "He does or will assist;" سينصر "He will *soon* assist;" &c. Among the Poets, it forms an object to which they are fond of comparing the regular teeth of a beautiful lady: as رشتهٔ دندان مثل سين; &c.

ش

THIS letter, following the vowel *Futha*, is a CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUN of the third person; and, in that character, has been the subject of our previous notice. After the vowel *Kusra*, it forms the HASILE' MUSDER of the fifth class; SEE VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 412 of this Work.

ش

THIS letter is employed, among the Arabs, for various purposes, which it is not necessary to explain here.

SECTION

SECTION FOURTH.

که

The letter کاف *quiescent,* following the vowel *Futha* at the end of a noun, forms the *Diminutive:* (See Volume First, Page 435.) as اَسْپَک *A little horse;* چِیزَک *A little thing;* &c. or the Relative: (Volume First, Page 443,) as کاوَک *Hollow;* اُذُنَک *An ear trumpet;* پُشْتَک *A short jacket;* یَدَک *A led horse;* &c.

As an Interrogative Pronoun, the word که is noticed in Chapter Fifth, Page 116 of this Volume; and as a Connective, employed to unite the relative clause of a given sentence with its proper antecedent, it has been fully considered in Chapter Fourth, Page 89, et Seq: to which the reader is therefore referred.

As a Connective, the word که is doubtless a Conjunction, corresponding with the English Conjunction that; and is employed, in this character, for many useful purposes of Speech, besides that of connecting the relative clause of a given sentence with its proper antecedent. It is the object of the present Section of this Chapter, to determine the nature of those relations which the Conjunctive که is found to denote; but before I proceed to detail the rules applicable to that subject, I think it necessary to offer a few observations on the nature of the English Conjunction that.

Mr. Harris has stated that the word that is sometimes a Pronoun; as "That is virtue;" or "Give me that;" and sometimes an Article; as "That habit is virtue;" or "Give me that book;" and sometimes a Conjunction; as "I wish you to believe that I would not hurt a fly;" &c. Now it is plain that whether we say "That is virtue;" or "That habit is virtue;" the sense of the word that is precisely

precisely the same in either case; and for the reasons stated in CHAPTER THIRD, PAGE 80, of this Volume, I am disposed to believe, that in either case, the word THAT is truly a Demonstrative noun. At all events, it is SELFSIGNIFICANT; and though certainly a *Definitive*, cannot therefore be assigned to the class of ARTICLES, because Articles properly so called, (as A and THE) are obviously PARTICLES, or CONSIGNIFICANT words.

THAT the demonstrative THAT is SELFSIGNIFICANT will be admitted, I believe, by every reader; and the CONSIGNIFICANCE of the word THE, will be rendered obvious by the following consideration; *namely*, that the Substantive Noun to which it is imputed, cannot be accurately omitted in Speech. It would be nonsense to say "Give me THE," for "Give me THE book;" but we may accurately say "Give me THAT," for "Give me THAT book;" and the fact, I believe, is utterly unaccountable, otherwise than by admitting the *consignificance* of the word THE, and the *selfsignificance* of the word THAT. I say, therefore, that the word THE is obviously a PARTICLE; and that the word THAT is *not* a Particle; and though both are properly considered as DEFINITIVES, they cannot therefore, on any principle, be accurately assigned to the same class of words. And though it may be maintained, for any thing I know to the contrary, that the word THE was selfsignificant among the ANGLO-SAXONS, it is easy to answer that argument simply by observing that I do not speak of its character among the ANGLO-SAXONS, of which indeed I have no knowledge; and that it is not selfsignificant now. It only remains to offer a few observations on the CONJUNCTIVE Nature of the word THAT.

Mr. TOOKE has clearly shewn that what has been termed the Conjunction THAT may be resolved into a Demonstrative Noun, in every example that can be adduced. His examples, indeed, are very numerous, and in my judgment quite satisfactory; but the RESOLVING PRINCIPLE is every where the

same,

ſame, and two will therefore ſuffice here. EXAMPLE: "I wiſh you to believe THAT I would not hurt a fly." RESOLUTION: "I would not hurt a fly, I wiſh you to believe THAT." EXAMPLE: "Thieves riſe by night, THAT they may cut men's throats." RESOLUTION: "Thieves may cut men's throats, (for) THAT (purpoſe) they riſe at night," &c. &c.

Now this is not only ingenious, but in my opinion perfectly juſt, conſidered with reference to the Engliſh Language; and I admit, therefore, that what has been termed the Engliſh *Conjunction* THAT, is, in fact, the Demonſtrative Noun (the *Article* or *Pronoun* Mr. TOOKE terms it) uſed, however, in a conjunctive ſenſe. And the ſame principle is plainly applicable to ſeveral other Tongues noticed by Mr. TOOKE, who has even ſhewn that the Latin Conjunction UT (anciently written UTI) THAT, is a corruption of the Greek Neuter Article ὅτι, adopted by the Latins for this conjunctive purpoſe of Speech.

BUT is it not plain that all this is merely fortuitous, and not, as MR. TOOKE would have us to believe, a *neceſſary* principle of Univerſal Grammar? He deſires us, on the baſis of this imperfect evidence, (See DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY, VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 86) to examine any Language we pleaſe, in the certain expectation of diſcovering in them *all* "a *ſuppoſed* CONJUNCTION, which they employ as we do THAT, and which is alſo the *ſame* word as their ſuppoſed ARTICLE OR PRONOUN."

Now I am unable to diſcover any ſuch Conjunction, either in the Arabic or Perſian Tongues; and, which is ſtill more unfortunate, I cannot ſee the *neceſſity* of its occurrence in either, though I grant the *poſſibility* of ſuch an event. To explain by an example. Mr. TOOKE is very probably right in ſtating that the Latin UT is a corruption of the Greek Neuter Article ὅτι; but the evidence of the fact is to be found in the Etymological proofs which he has adduced, and

not certainly in the necessity of the case. Let us suppose the word UT to be *no* corruption at all, but a primitive particle, invented by the Latins for the purpose of expressing a given conjunctive sense. Is MR. TOOKE, prepared to prove the *absurdity* of such a proposition, or the *necessity* of employing an Article or a Pronoun, and *nothing else*, to express a relation obviously Conjunctive? He has indeed shewn the *fitness* or *capacity* of the Article or Pronoun to express that relation in certain Tongues; and had the accident happened, it might, for any thing I know to the contrary, have been so employed in every Tongue. But that which *may* happen is obviously fortuitous or contingent, since the fact of its occurrence, in any given Language, must be open to the suspicion of truth and falshood. And that which *must* happen is alone fit to be received as a principle of Universal Grammar, which (to me at least) is a word without meaning, if it deals in any thing short of NECESSARY TRUTH.

I SHALL now suppose with MR. TOOKE, that the demonstrative THAT is every where employed in a conjunctive sense; and still, I affirm, that the fact is *contingent* by its own nature, and cannot, therefore, be received as a principle of General Grammar. And that which is not a principle of General Grammar, cannot be maintained of any one Language, except on specific proofs of the fact, deduced from the Language to which it relates: whence it follows, that the CONJUNCTIVE sense of the Demonstrative THAT cannot be assumed as a principle of Arabic and Persian Grammar, because we have not hitherto been furnished with the necessary proofs of the fact. For the Persian DEMONSTRATIVE آن THAT, can never supply the place of the Conjunctive که; nor can the Persian CONJUNCTIVE که THAT, supply the place of the Demonstrative آن. And though I admit that the word که, like the Latin UT, *may* be an ARTICLE or a PRONOUN in some Lan-

guage

guage or other, I am utterly at a loſs to diſcover the ſhadow of a reaſon why the fact is of any importance, or why, in the name of common ſenſe, it *muſt* be conſidered as a NECESSARY TRUTH.

FOR whether true or falſe, the CONJUNCTIVE character of the word *ſ* will not be affected in either caſe; any more than the CONJUNCTIVE character of the Latin UT or UTI is affected by the fact of its derivation, or otherwiſe, from the Greek neuter article ὅτι. For if I were diſpoſed to deny the accuracy of that derivation, I might reaſonably obſerve that the evidence adduced by MR. TOOKE, is by no means of a demonſtrative or concluſive nature; ſince it is ſupported chiefly by the ſimilarity of ſound, which might be the effect of accident alone. But in truth, the fact is ſo remarkably innocent of important conſequences, or indeed of any conſequence at all, that I am under no temptation to deny its accuracy; and MR. TOOKE may enjoy his diſcovery, undiſturbed by any ſuggeſtions of mine, if he will only be candid enough not to intrude it, hereafter, as a NECESSARY principle of Univerſal Grammar. Of this and other ſimilar intruſions, every Grammarian has a right to complain; for if MR. TOOKE's principles ſhall be finally eſtabliſhed, there is an end to the poſſibility of writing Grammars, except on the abſtruſe, tedious, and uncertain principles of Etymological Science, in which few men living have any tolerable ſkill.

To thoſe who believe that the CONJUNCTIVE *ſ muſt* be an ARTICLE or a PRONOUN in ſome Language or other, I commit the care of tracing its Etymology; and ſhall now proceed to detail, to the beſt of my ability, the nature of thoſe ſpecific relations, which, as a connective, this Particle is commonly found to denote.

RULE

RULE FIRST.

The Particle كه may be accurately employed to establish the relation existing between the relative clause of a given sentence and the proper antecedent; as explained in Chapter 4th, Page 89, of this Volume. Example: هر که سنگت زند شکر بخشش "Give sugar to him who pelts you with stones;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

It may be accurately employed to indicate the relation of Explanation, known in Grammar by the term تبیین. In this case, the Particle كه is known by the term كاف بیانیه; and governs a sentence employed to dispel some doubt inherent in the nature of that which precedes it. The sentence following the particle كه may be therefore, in this case, consider-ed as an answer to the Interrogative *What?* Example: بمردی که ملک سراسر زمین "I swear by humanity *(What?)* that the empire of the world نیرزد که خونی چکد بر زمین is not worthy *(of what?)* that it should be purchased at the expence of one drop of blood." The examples of this class are exceedingly numerous, and will occur to the observation of every reader. The particle كه is however, in this case, sometimes omitted in speech: as رفتم بطبیب و گفتمش بیمارم "I went to the doctor, and told him *(What?)* that I was ill;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

It may be accurately employed to denote the relation signified by the term تعلیل or Causation; and governs, in this case, a sentence which answers the Interrogative *Why?* Example: جریده رو که گذرگاه عافیت تنگ است "Go alone *(Why?)* because the road of safety is a narrow path;" &c. Or the relation signified by the term علت غائی; in which case, the sentence fol-

lowing

lowing the Particle که will indicate the PURPOSE to be effected by an action specified in the preceding sentence. This is but another species of CAUSATION, and the sentence following the Particle که will therefore answer the Interrogative *Why?* Example: وصف دهانش کن که سخن مختصر شود "Describe her mouth, *(Why?)* that your description may be short or small as it is." To this rule I refer the example مده رخصت ظلم را هیچ حال "Never permit the practice of tyranny, *(Why?)* که خورشید ملکت بیابد زوال because the sun of your Empire *will* set;" (which is the relation signified by the term تعلیل ;) or که خورشید ملکت نیابد زوال "That the sun of your Empire may *not* set;" (which is the relation signified by the term علت غائی.) SEE PAGE 347 of this Volume.

RULE FOURTH.

IT may be accurately employed to denote the relation signified in Grammar by the term اضراب, and more commonly expressed by the word بل. The term اضراب is of two kinds: *first*, ترقی or ASCENSION; in which the second sentence forms a CLIMAX to the first: as نام حق بر زبان همی رانم "I utter the name of GOD with my tongue;" که بجان و دلش همی خوانم "Nay, I call on him with my whole heart:" and *secondly*, اعراض or TURNING AWAY; in which the second sentence corrects an error pointed out in the first: as غوغای عاشقان و تمنای عارفان "The aspirations of men truly inspired by the DIVINE LOVE, حرص بهشت نیست که شوق لقای تست are not directed to the joys of HEAVEN; no! they are occasioned solely by the desire of beholding THEE;" &c.* RULE

* THE sentiment in the text is of common occurrence among the SOOFEE POETS; and it seems to me that there is something in it to excite, at once, our admiration and pity. Their love of GOD is occasioned, according to them, solely by

RULE FIFTH.

It may be accurately employed to denote the relation of Comparison, known in Grammar by the terms تشبیه وتمثیل. Example: کیست چنین پیش که دارد کرا "Who supplicates thee so much as I do?" Or the relation known by the term مفاجات, which indicates the sudden or unexpected occurrence of a given event. Example: با زید سخن می گفتم که یارم از در در آمد "I was conversing with Zyde, when lo! my friend entered the room;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

It has been supposed to indicate, occasionally, the relation signified by واو عاطفه or the Conjunctive And; though, in my opinion, it may be more accurately translated, in all the examples of this class, by the words while; whereas; &c. Example: بسا چاره دان کو به سختی بمرد و که بیچاره گوی سلامت به برد "Many a man possessed of resources has died in distress;" "*While* or *Whereas* or *And*, another apparently destitute of means, has yet borne away the ball of safety."

RULE SEVENTH.

It may be accurately employed to establish that relation

---

by the contemplation of his perfections, and is of a nature too pure and exalted to be sullied by the intermixture of *any* interested consideration whatever. On this principle, they dare to contemn the joys of Heaven itself, when proposed as a motive to stimulate the ardor of their devotion to him; just as a lover desires to convince his earthly mistress, that the fortune which it may be in her power to bestow, has no share in the disinterested ardor of his attachment to her person. So, in the following couplet, Haufiz treats with utter contempt, the rational devotion of those among his countrymen, who are influenced, in their adoration of the Supreme Being, by the interested hope of eternal happiness in a future state.

تو و طوبی و ما و قامت یار　　　فکر هر کس بقدر همت اوست

This is a pitch of wild and daring enthusiasm, to which the Saints and Sectaries of modern Europe have not, I believe, hitherto reached. It would be the very acmé of impious presumption, if there could be any such thing as unintentional guilt.

which exists between the مُفَضَّل and the مُفَضَّل عَلَيه, the former being an إسم تفضيل in the Comparative Degree. In this case, therefore, it supplies the place of the Preposition از. Example: بسیار شنیده ام از بزرگان "For I have often heard from men of eminence;" که صبر درویش به از بذل غنی "That the patience of the POOR is more meritorious (in the sight of God) than the liberality of the RICH."

RULE EIGHTH.

IT may accurately govern a PARENTHETICAL sentence, comprising a prayer whether good or evil; and in this case, though perhaps not properly a PLEONASM, it is never translated into the English Language. Example: چشم بد اندیش که بر کنده باد "In the eye of the malignant or envious man (may it be torn out") عیب نماید هنرش در نظر "Excellence itself appears as a defect;" &c.

RULE NINTH.

IT may govern the second member of a CONDITIONAL sentence, comprising a شرط and a جزا. Example: گرم چو عود بر آتش نهی و بگدازی "If you roast me on the fire like the wood of aloes;" که نقش خال نگارم نمی رود ز ضمیر "Even then, the impression made by the mole on the cheek of my beloved, will never be eradicated from my heart." In conversation, though seldom perhaps in written composition, the Particle که is often found to occur as a PLEONASM, between the SUBJECT and the PREDICATE of a given proposition. Example: زید که بخیل است و بکر که سخی است "ZYDE is avaricious, and BUKR is liberal; &c.

CONCLUSION.

THE preceding are all the rules relating to the use and application of the Particle که, which I have been able to collect

in

in the Persian Language; and though it has been observed that this Particle sometimes indicates the relation of NEGATION (نَفْی;) or of REPULSION (تَرْدِیْد;) the examples of that class that have occurred to my notice, may, I believe, be more accurately comprised under the relation of the مُفَضَّل and the مُفَضَّل عَلَیْه, as already detailed in the SEVENTH RULE. Example: بِه مُردن بِه گوشتِ ی تَمَنّا "It is better to die for want of meat;" کِه تَقاضای زِشتِ قَصّابان "THAN to bear the abominable dunning of the butchers."

ACCORDING to the opinion of some Grammarians, *the* Particle کِه is here synonimous with نُونِ نَفْی "It is better to die for want of meat, NOT to bear the dunning of the butchers;" and others will have it, that the example is Interrogative: "Is it better to die for want of meat, OR to bear the dunning of the butchers?" in which case, the Particle کِه is synonimous with یا OR, and is supposed to denote the relation of REPULSION. The nature of the interrogation is that known by the term اِستِفْهامِ تَرْدِیْدی; and the sense of the sentence is, that DEATH is incomparably *the* better choice.

IT is plain, however, that this example may be accurately assigned to the Seventh Rule: "It is better to die for want of meat, THAN to bear the dunning of the *butchers*;" and I have not, therefore, thought it necessary to admit the opinion of those Grammarians who desire to have this and other similar examples withdrawn from the influence of that rule.

THERE are other examples in which the Particle کِه may appear, to a superficial observer, to denote relations not specified in any of the rules: as چِه کُنَد کُشتهٔ عِشقَت کِه نَگُوْیَد غَمِ دِل "What shall the victim of your love do, IF not permitted to disclose his grief?" in which case, the word اَگَر IF, might (accurately as to the sense,) supply the place of the Particle کِه.

I

I conceive, however, that the particle ل is here uſed to indicate the relation exiſting between the Antecedent and the Relative Clause of the ſentence: " What ſhall the victim of love do, *who* is not permitted to diſcloſe (or more literally, who does not diſcloſe) his grief?" and the example is therefore accurately compriſed under the relation ſpecified in the First Rule.

It is nevertheleſs poſſible that ſome of the relations expreſſed by the particle ل, may have eſcaped the induſtry of my enquiries; and that others may have been aſſigned to various rules, which ought to be compriſed in the ſame rule. Nay the reader may poſſibly diſcover ſome one ſenſe of the particle ل, which will be accurately applicable to every example adduced in illuſtration of all the rules; but even in that caſe, the utility of the rules will not be ſuperceded, or even diminiſhed in my judgment, ſince it is quite clear that many of the relations ſignified by that particle, are eſſentially different in their own nature, though it may be alſo true, for any thing I know to the contrary, that there exiſts in the Engliſh Language, ſome *one* word of a nature ſo very indefinite, as to be accurately capable of expreſſing them all.

SECTION FIFTH.

لام ميم نون

لام

There is little to be obſerved on the nature and application of the letter لِ, which, being moveable by the vowel *Kuſra*, is an Arabic Preposition correſponding with the Perſian براى For. It indicates the relation of appropriation: as اَلْجُلُّ لِلْفَرَسِ, " The covering belongs to the horſe;" or of property, which is another ſpecies of appropriation; as لزيد

اَلْمَالُ لِزَيْدٍ "The money belongs to ZYDE;" &c. When moveable by the vowel *Futha*, it commonly indicates the relation signified by the term اِسْتِغَاثَہ COMPLAINT; or SEEKING ASSISTANCE: as يَا لَلّٰهِ لِلْمُسْلِمِيْن "O GOD, assist the Moosulmauns!" in which, the letter لَم governs the name of the DEITY.

THE shape of the letters ج and ل has been the occasion of their assumption, by the Persian Poets, as objects with which to compare the curling locks of a beautiful Lady: as اَلِف سان قَدِّی داشْتَم هَسْت عُمْرِی "I had a form straight as the letter ALIF, but it is now an age;" کِہ شُد دال اَز غَمِ زُلْفِ چُو لامَت "Since it has been bent into the shape of the letter DAUL, by the love of your locks, curling as LAUM." Sometimes, the names of these letters are employed as common substantive nouns, to signify the ringlets of a lady's hair.

ميم

THE letter م, moveable by the vowel *Futha*, is employed to form the PROHIBITIVE in the second persons singular and plural: as مَكُن; مَكُنِيْد; &c. and the PRECATIVE in the third person singular: as مَكُنَاد; مَدِهَاد; مَرِيزَاد; مَبِيفْتَاد; &c. In this case, the first letter of the verb may be optionally rendered quiescent, if not followed by a quiescent letter: as مَتَرْس or مَتْرِس; and will continue to be moveable by its own proper vowel point, if the second letter of the verb shall not be moveable: as مَكُن; مَكُوْش; مَگِير; &c.

AT the end of a CARDINAL NUMERAL, the letter م forms the ORDINAL: as چَهارُم *Fourth*; بِيسْتُم *Twentieth*; &c. And at

at the end of certain nouns, (probably Turkiſh,) it forms a mark of the femenine gender: as بتیر "A gentleman;" (literally "Choſen" or "Selected;") بتیرم "A Lady;" بیگ "A Lord;" بیگم "A Lady;" &c.

At the end of a verb, it forms the pronominal nominative of the firſt perſon: as گفتم "I ſaid:" or, more rarely, the accuſative or object to the third perſon: as برانگیختم; for برانگیخت مرا "He excited me;" &c. After nouns, it forms the conjunctive perſonal pronoun of the firſt perſon: as برادرم "My brother;" یارم "My friend;" &c. or a contracted form of the verb ام: as خدمتگزارم و چاکرم "I am a ſervant;" &c.

The ſhape of the letter م (or rather of its head) has furniſhed the poets with an object to which they are fond of comparing the ſmall and pretty mouth of a beautiful woman.

نون

The letter ن is a Negative Particle; as نرفت "He did not go;" نرود "Let him not go;" &c. When combined with می, it is commonly prefixed to that particle; as نمی روم و نمی رفتم: but ſometimes, though rarely, is obſerved to follow it: as تو گر پرنیان می نیابی خموش "If you find no ſilk, be ſilent neverthleſs."

It has been obſerved by ſome Grammarians, that there is a difference of ſenſe between the examples نمی کنم and می نکنم; نمی کردم and می نکردم; &c. the former being employed to

denote

denote what has been termed نفی استمرار "The negation of the continuative ſenſe implied in the particle مى ;" and the latter being employed to denote what has been termed استمرار النفی "The duration of the negative ſenſe implied in the uſe of the negative particle." In this caſe, نمی دیدم ſignifies "I did not *continue* to ſee;" and می ندیدم ſignifies "I continued *not* to ſee;" but there is not, I believe, any foundation in the common uſage of the Language, for this refined diſtinction of ſenſe, and both examples may be therefore conſidered as entirely ſynonimous in every reſpect.

THERE is little to be obſerved on the uſe and application of the NEGATIVE PARTICLE to the purpoſes of Speech. It muſt be generally repeated before the ſecond of two nouns, or of two verbs, connected together by a copulative conjunction: as زید نخورد و نخوابید "ZYDE neither ate nor ſlept;" نه مصر و نه افرنگ ماند نه روم "Neither will Egypt nor Europe nor Turkey remain;" &c. But in the caſe of two nouns, the negative particle is ſometimes omitted before the *ſecond*: as چون حسن عاقبت نه برندی و زاهدی است "Since future happineſs depends neither on profligacy nor on *devotion*," (but ſolely on the inſcrutible diſpenſations of GOD;) &c. When the negative particle is not followed by a verb, it often ſupplies the place of the COPULATIVE CONJUNCTION, which may be elegantly omitted, though often inſerted, in ſuch caſes: as نه زید آمد نه عمر "Neither is ZYDE come nor is AMR;" زید نه شاعر است نه عالم or زید نه شاعر است و نه عالم "Neither is ZYDE Learned, nor is he a Poet;" &c.

THE letter ن, following the vowel *Futha* at the end of a word, is employed, *firſt*, as a mark of the INFINITIVE: as کردن ; مردن ; گفتن ; &c. *ſecondly*, to form the RELATIVE NOUN:

NOUN: (SEE VOL. I, PAGE 444) as لنجن *Thick lipped;* ریمن *Filthy;* &c. *thirdly,* to form a رابط, or MARK OF CONNEXION, analogous to the nature of our fubftantive verb: as زید خوشن "ZYDE is pleafed;" a form of conftruction which is now become obfolete: and, *finally,* as a PLEONASM in certain Examples: fuch as پاداشن for پاداش *Retribution;* &c.

ANY thing crooked may be compared to the letter نون; as in the following example, extracted from an amufing Satire on Human Life, in which the actions of all mankind are afcribed, univerfally, to the love of money.

خوشنویسی که شب و روز کند مشق جنون
تا باسلوب نویسد همه حرف موزون
گردنش دال و سرش واو و تنش گردد نون
دیده اش صاد و لبش میم و دلش گردد خون
این همه از پی آن است که زر می خواهد

I SHALL not venture to tranflate thefe verfes, but it may be neceffary to inform the European reader, that the author means to defcribe the fevere labour of the KHOSH NŬVEES, (a man whofe profeffion is that of writing in a very fine hand;) and this he has done by exhibiting the attitude in which he writes, in a manner at once lively, forcible, and ludicrous even for its very abfurdity.

SECTION SIXTH.

واو ها یا

واو

THE letter واو, moveable by the vowel *Futha,* is one of the

حَرْفِ عَطْف : "A copulative conjunction," ſignifying AND. In common Language, as well as in poetry, it generally aſſumes the ſound of the vowel *Zumma*, applicable to the laſt letter of the word which precedes it: as زَیْدُ وعَمْرْ آمَدَنْد "ZYDE and AMR came." After a word ending in ہای مُخْتَفی, or in ALIF or WAO quieſcent, it commonly aſſumes the ſound of هَمْزَۀ مُلَیَّنَہ or *the ſoft Humza*, moveable by the vowel *Zumma*: as تُو ؤُ طُوبَی "You and the tree *Tooba*;" سِینَہ ؤُ پا ؤُ دَسْت "The breaſt, the hands, and the feet;" &c. In proſe at the beginning of a ſentence and elſewhere, or in poetry when the meaſure of the verſe may happen to require it, the letter و ا و muſt receive the vowel *Futha*.

THE uſe of the COPULATIVE CONJUNCTION واو عاطفہ ſeems to be that of JOINING TOGETHER two or more nouns ſubſtantive or adjective; or two or more verbs; or perfect propoſitions; as زَیْدُ و عَمْر آمَدَنْد "ZYDE and AMR came;" زَیْد عالِم و شاعِر اَسْت "ZYDE is learned and a poet;" زَیْد آمَد و نِشَسْت "ZYDE came and ſat down;" زَیْد آمَد و عَمْر رَفْت "ZYDE came and AMR departed;" &c. Of the nouns, verbs and perfect propoſitions, thus joined together, the firſt is termed مَعْطُوفٌ عَلَیْہ "The thing with which ſomething elſe is joined;" and the ſecond مَعْطُوف: or "The thing joined with ſomething elſe."

IN the caſe of a negative ſentence, the NEGATIVE PARTICLE muſt be generally repeated before the مَعْطُوف: as نَہ زَیْد عالِم اَسْت وَ نَہ عَمْر "Neither is ZYDE learned nor is AMR;" زَیْد نَخُورْد و نَخُوابِید "ZYDE neither ate nor ſlept;" &c. And the reaſon is obvious, ſince the non-repetition of the negative particle would leave the ſentence doubtful or obſcure. For the negation of a *whole* propoſition is equally

obtained

obtained by the negation of *any* or of *all* its parts, and hence it follows that the phraſe "ZYDE and AMR did not come" (زَیدُ و عَمرُ نیامدند) is equally true; *firſt*, when either came but not the other; and, *ſecondly*, when neither the one nor the other came. And on the ſame principle, the phraſe "All this is not true" involves a palpable obſcurity; becauſe it means that "A PART OF THE WHOLE is poſitively falſe;" but whether A PART OF THE WHOLE cannot be determined, otherwiſe than by the aid of the context alone. For if *a part* be falſe, it is very plain that "all is not true;" and if *the whole* be falſe, it is equally plain that "All is not true;" or in other words that "The whole is falſe." I ſay, therefore, that the phraſe زَیدْ نَه عالِمُ و شاعِر اَست or زَیدْ عالِمُ و شاعِر نیست "ZYDE is not learned and a poet," (and ſo alſo of every ſimilar example) involves an obvious obſcurity; *firſt*, becauſe it may ſignify that "ZYDE is neither learned nor a poet;" and, *ſecondly*, becauſe it may ſignify that "He is not learned, though he may be a poet;" or that "He is not a poet, though he may be very learned." And the repetition of the negative before the مَعطُوف is plainly intended to diſpel this obſcurity; becauſe the phraſe زَیدْ نَه عالِم اَست و نَه شاعِر will neceſſarily ſignify that "ZYDE is neither learned nor a poet," and cannot poſſibly have any other ſenſe.

THAT the obſcurity inherent in the nature of all ſuch phraſes is common to the Engliſh, as well as to the Perſian Language and to every other Tongue, muſt, I think, be ſufficiently obvious from the following examples: "ZYDE and AMR did not come, but ZYDE came alone;" "ZYDE is not learned and a poet, but he is very learned, though he is not a poet;" &c. Whence it may be inferred that the principle on which the obſcurity depends; *namely*, that "the negation of a given propoſition is equally obtained by the negation of

any

any or all its parts," is essentially true in the nature of things, and consequently a principle of General Grammar.

I SHALL now proceed to offer a few rules (not very important) for the use and application of the particle واو عاطفه, or the conjunctive AND. I admit that this particle has no *real* fluctuations of sense, and suppose, on Mr. TOOKE's principles, that it may be always accurately translated by the words ADD or GIVE; though the former is probably the better term. To this general sense of the word AND, every reader will be easily able to refer the *seeming* fluctuations in the sense of this particle, that are noticed in some of the following rules.

RULE FIRST.

THE particle واو is very frequently employed to indicate the relation known by the term ملازمت, "The constant conjunction of two or more objects;" and more commonly expressed by the preposition با WITH. In this case, the verb is usually and elegantly omitted in speech. Examples: تو و صد کامرانی و نشاط و خاطر خرم "You are destined to every species of happiness;" من و مسکینی و صد ناتوانی و دل پر غم "And I to misery, wretchedness, and a heart full of grief!"

RULE SECOND.

IT has been supposed to indicate the relation signified by the term تعلیل or CAUSATION, when employed to connect the دلیل and the مدلول; "The proof with that which is to be proved." Example: در تمنای رخش عمر عزیزت سلمان "In the desire of beholding her countenance, your life, O SŬLMAUN!" بسر آمد و هر چیز سر آید دارد "Has verged to a close, and truly such is the fate of sublunary things!"

RULE THIRD.

IT may be accurately employed to connect the حال with the

the ذُو الحال, (See Rule 5th, of the Chapter that treats of the حال) when the former happens to be a perfect ſentence. Example: فریاد من ز ظالم گردون گذشت و نیست "My wailings have paſſed through the vaulted heavens, yet have they not امکان آنکه زحمت این آستان دهد the power of doing injury to this threſhold;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It may be accurately employed, like the particle یا Or, to detail the ſubordinate ſpecies compriſed in the ſenſe of ſome general term: as کلمه اسم است و فعل است و حرف "A word is either noun, verb, or particle." Or to ſignify the relation known by the term اباحت Rendering lawful: as بنشین با زید و عمر "Sit down with Zyde or Amr;" that is to ſay, "with both or either." Or the relation ſignified by the term تخییر Giving a choice: as قید و جلای وطن بر خود گوارا کن "Embrace (at your choice) baniſhment or captivity." Or the relation ſignified by the term تعویض or Exchange: as این اسب و هزار روپیه مبایعت می کنم "I will ſell this horſe for a thouſand rupees." Or to form what has been termed the عطف تفسیری, in which the معطوف and the معطوف علیه are both ſignificant of the ſame, or nearly the ſame idea: as خویش و تبار "Friends and relations;" گوشه تجرید و تفرید "The corner of ſolitude and lonelineſs;" &c. Or as a Pleonasm before یا: as ببینیم تا اسب اسفندیار "We ſhall ſee whether the horſe of Isfundiar سوی خانه آید همی بی سوار will return home without his rider;" و یا باره رستم جنگجو "Or whether the horſe of the warlike Roostum بآخر نهد بی خداوند رو will return home without his maſter;" that is to ſay, "We ſhall wait to ſee whoſe lot it is to fall before the proweſs of the other;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

THE CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUNS of the Persian Language cannot be followed by the particle واو, and must be therefore superceded, in the case of its occurrence, by the DISJUNCTIVE PRONOUNS. Examples: زدم ترا و زید را never زدمت و زید را "I struck you and ZYDE;" گفتم اورا و بکررا, never گفتمش و بکررا "I spoke to him and BUKR;" آمدم من و زید, never آمدم و زید "ZYDE and I CAME;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

IF the معطوف علیه shall be two nouns connected together by means of the relation of the genetive case, the governing noun must be repeated in the معطوف, if its repetition shall be necessary for the purpose of dispelling an obscurity in the sentence. Example: چاکر تو و چاکر بکر "Your servant and the servant of BUKR." The words چاکر تو و بکر would signify "Your servant and the person named BUKR;" or perhaps "The joint servant BUKR and you."

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE nothing more to observe on the nature of the COPULATIVE CONJUNCTION, which may be accurately omitted in prose or in verse, for the sake of the measure, or for the purpose of adding to the melody of a period: as جفا جو زود رنجی بی وفا نامهربان شوخی &c. The verb also, being expressed in the معطوف علیه, may be accurately omitted in the معطوف, which is the common practise of ancient writers: as حکیمان دیر دیر خورند و عابدان نیم سیر "Philosophers eat after long intervals, and devotees with great moderation;" or it may be (and very commonly is) reserved by modern writers, for the last of a long series of propositions, connected together

together by the copulative conjunction. Nay, it very often happens, in ſuch examples, that the verb underſtood, varies in each member of the ſentence: in which caſe, it muſt be ſignificant of ſome general idea, ſuch as may be eaſily ſupplied by the underſtanding of the reader. In the following example, extracted from the " Hiſtory of NADIR SHAH," a work celebrated for the multiplicity of ſuch omiſſions, the verbs underſtood are inſerted by me between parentheſes.

مَرْکَبِ ایلغار را تیز تگ (نموده) و در یک شب از نظام واردِ کنارِ رودِ اترک (گردیده) و فوجی از آن گروهِ بدرگ را عرضهٔ پالارگ ساخته واردِ استراباد شدند

" Having given ſpeed to the horſe of haſte, he marched, in one night, from NEZAUM to the banks of the ATRUG; and putting to the ſword a ſquadron of that infamous tribe, he then entered the city of ISTRABAUD."

IT only remains to be remarked that the letter واو, *quieſcent*, at the end of a word, is ſometimes a mark of the RELATIVE: (VOL. FIRST, PAGE 444) as آبو " A water lilly;" خفتو " The night mare;" &c. and ſometimes, though rarely, a mark of the DIMINUTIVE: (VOL. FIRST, PAGE 437) as پسرو " A little boy;" دخترو " A little girl;" &c. In the Arabic Language, the letter واو is ſometimes perfixed to the noun by which we ſwear: as وَاللّٰه " By GOD;" وراس النبی " By the head of the Prophet;" &c.

ه

THE letter ه is one of the حروفِ نسبی or RELATIVE PARTICLES: and, in that character, has already been the ſubject of diſcuſſion in VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 444 of this Work. Like all the relative particles, it denotes an INDEFINITE RELATION, which may yet become SPECIFIC in any given example, by the arbitrary authority of preſcription alone. Examples: دسته or قبضه " A handle;" زبانه " Flame;" or " The tongue

tongue of a balance;" دَمَه "The asthma;" or "A pair of bellows;" هَرُّرُوزَه "Daily;" دَرْمَاهَه "Wages paid by the month;" &c. &c.

WHEN added to the HAUSILÉ MUSDER of the 2d Class, (SEE VOLUME I, PAGE 410,) it forms the PAST ACTIVE PARTICIPLE; or the SIMPLE PASSIVE PARTICIPLE: as كُشْتَه "Having slain;" or "The person slain;" دِیدَه "Having seen;" or "The object seen;" &c. Or, in the case of a neuter verb, it forms a simple adjective noun: as خُفْتَه "Asleep;" مُرْدَه "Dead;" &c. the latter, as well as the former, being a simple adjective, not a participle, according to the opinion of Eastern writers, because it denotes the EXISTENCE of DEATH in a given object or substantive noun. The letter ه, occurring in this situation, may be also a PLEONASM: as زَیْد آمَد or زَیْد آمَدَه "ZYDE is come;" زَیْد کَسِی را کُشْت or زَیْد کَسِی را کُشْتَه "ZYDE has slain somebody;" &c.

AT the end of a noun, it may be sometimes a PLEONASM: as اَنْبَار or اَنْبَارَه "A granary;" &c. or it may be employed, merely, as an instrument for the enunciation of the vowel *Futha*, when that vowel point happens to be applicable to the preceding letter: as خَامَه "A pen;" Plural خَامَها; جَامَه "A garment;" Plural جَامَها; &c.

ی

THE letter ی is of two kinds, مَعْرُوف و مَجْهُول; and both are employed for various useful purposes of Speech, most of which are known to the reader. It will be sufficient therefore, at this period of his progress, to offer a cursory sketch of the use and application of this letter, considered under each of the two characters which it is found to assume. The details will be found in various parts of this Work, to which I shall here have occasion to refer.

THE

یای معروف

THE letter یای معروف, at the end of a Persian verb, forms the pronominal nominative of the second person singular: as پری ؛ روی ؛ رفتی ؛ آمدی ؛ &c. and after های مختفی or *the gentle Aspirate*, is converted into همزه, or the termination ای: as رفته ؛ گفته ؛ کرده ؛ otherwise written رفته ای ؛ گفته ای ؛ کرده ای ؛ &c.

AFTER an Arabic noun, it sometimes forms a CONJUNCTIVE PRONOUN of the first person singular: as شفیقی "My friend;" or "O my friend!" کریمی "My benefactor;" الهی "My GOD;" or a mark of the مبالغه or INTENSIVE SUPERLATIVE: as احمری "Most exceedingly red;" علامی "Most exceedingly wise;" and other examples of the same nature. After the name of A TRIBE OR A NATION, it restricts to UNITY the sense of the primitive: as روم "The Romans;" رومی "A Roman;" (of the Eastern Empire,) عرب "The Arabians; عربی "An Arabian;" &c.

AFTER a Persian Infinitive, it generally indicates the relation signified by the term لیاقت or FITNESS: as گفتنی "FIT to be spoken;" کردنی "FIT to be done;" &c. Example: در کار باده کوش که کاری است کردنی "Persist in the habit of drinking wine, for that is an action fit to be done;" &c. After Arabic and Persian Adjectives and Epithets, and after many Substantive Nouns, it forms the HASILE MUSDER of the FIRST CLASS: being subject, in that case, to the permutations detailed in the rules for the formation of that Noun: (SEE VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 405, ET SEQ:) Examples: نیکی "Goodness;" بدی "Evil;" دانائی "Knowledge;" عاقلی "Wisdom;" مظلومی "Oppression;" (in a Passive Sense) پائی "Humility;" from

پائی "The foot;" حاتمی "Generosity;" from حاتم The proper name of a man; &c.

After many Arabic and Persian nouns, it forms one of the حروف نسبی or Relative Particles: and in that character has been fully considered, with all its permutations, in the First Volume, Page 247 and 445, to which the reader is therefore referred. Or it may form the Substantive Verb in the second person singular: as غلامی "You are a slave;" چالاکی "You are active;" &c. and *in this case* will be changed *into Humza*, after the gentle aspirate, or the letter ا: as کیٔ "Who are you?" چهٔ "What are you?" نهٔ "You are not;" آدمی "You are a man;" &c. Example: رو که چنان نازک و موزون نهٔ "Go! for you are not so very handsome."

یای مجهول

The letter یای مجهول, at the end of a Persian Verb, is employed to form the Continuative Preterite in three of its persons: as کردمی; کردی; کردی; کردندی; &c. In this case, it indicates, *first*, the duration of a given event for some definite or indefinite period of past time: as زید هر روز نزد من آمدی "Zyde continued to visit me daily;" or, *secondly*, the feelings of desire or regret, occasioned by the occurrence or otherwise of a given event: as کاشکی که سعادت شهادت دریافتمی "Would that I had obtained the happiness of martyrdom!" or, *finally*, the mutual dependence on each other, at some period of past time, of two events connected by the relation of Cause and Effect: as اگر زید نیامدی من نرفتمی "If Zyde had not come,

come, I would have gone;" &c. (See the CHAPTER that treats of the CONTINUATIVE PRETERITE.)

AT the end of a Generic Noun, the letter یای مجهول forms the INDEFINITE ARTICLE, as already explained in the Chapter that treats of GENERIC NOUNS. In this character, it has sometimes the force of یای تنکیر or, *the Indefinite Ya;* as کتابی از کتبخانه بیار "Bring me a book (no matter what book) from the library;" and sometimes the force of یای وحدت or *Ya of Unity;* as شبی تا روز خفته بودم "I slept *one* night until morning;" &c.

THE letter یای تنکیر is rhetorically employed for various useful purposes of Speech: as, *first*, to indicate the relation of SIMILITUDE, known in Grammar by the term مشابهت: as آن دم که با تو باشم یک سال هست روزی "In your presence, a year is as a day;" or, "passes away with the rapidity of a day;" &c. or, *secondly*, to denote VENERATION or CONTEMPT, known by the terms تعظیم و تحقیر: as زید مردی است "ZYDE is a man;" that is to say, "He is eminent for all the qualities that may become a man;" آن جا رفتم و چیزی یافتم "I went thither and obtained something;" that is to say, "a mere trifle;" &c.

AFTER های مختفی or the *Gentle Aspirate*, the letter یای تنکیر is changed into *Humza:* as بندهٔ "A slave;" دیوانهٔ "A madman;" &c. and after the PROPER NAMES of men celebrated for a certain attribute, it converts these into EPITHETS significant of such attribute: as فرعونی "A PHAROAH," or

"proud

"proud man;" حاتمی "A Hautim," or "liberal man;" حجاجی "A Hudjauj," or "tyrant;" &c. It may occur between a given substantive and the following attributive which is imputed to it: as مردی عاقل "A wise man;" but if the attributive shall form a perfect sentence, the particle که must then be superadded: as چشمی که ترا ندیده باشد "An eye which has not seen you;" &c. It may also follow the مفعول مطلق for the purposes stated in treating of that noun: as بپیمای پیمودنی باده چند "Measure out wine in several measurements;" or it may be a PLEONASM after فلان; as خوبی آنست و لطافت که فلانی دارد "That only is beauty and grace, which is the portion of such a person;" &c.

The vowel کسره of the مضاف or موصوف, may be lengthened in poetry into the sound of یا, in order to fill up the measure of a verse: as محنتِ دوران رسد روزی بپایان غم مخور "Be not grieved, since the evils of fortune will one day cease;" دلِ شکسته که در زلفِ سرکشت بستم "My broken heart, which I bound in the ringlets of your curling (refractory) locks;" &c.

CHAPTER THIRD.

OF PERSIAN PARTICLES AND OTHER WORDS COMPRISING MORE THAN ONE LETTER.

It is my intention, in this Chapter, to consider in the order of Aphabetical arrangement, the remaining particles of the Persian Language; omitting those only which have been fully explained in some preceding part of the work, and embracing certain other words, such as YES or NO, which appear to me to be self-significant, and therefore not to belong to the class of particles. With regard to the true character of these two words, I can hardly venture to offer an opinion. They may have

have been originally verbs or nouns, according to the ſyſtem maintained by Mr. Tooke ; but admitting the fact, they have ceaſed, I conceive, to be verbs or nouns, without acquiring the character of particles, and cannot *now* therefore be accurately compriſed under any one of the three parts of ſpeech.

It ſeems to me that theſe two words bear the ſame relation to a ſentence, which a pronoun bears to its noun of reference ; for if we anſwer yes or no to a man who has occaſion to aſk a queſtion, we affirm or deny the ſenſe of the queſtion, and therefore each of theſe two words does in fact comprize in itſelf the force of a whole propoſition to which it refers, and of which it is employed to ſupply the place. There are, I believe, in every Language, a few other words of doubtful character, the nature of which may furniſh ſome reaſon to ſuſpect that the triple diviſion of words into nouns verbs and particles is really imperfect; embracing indeed the far greater part of the materials of every Language, but not abſolutely including the whole. I now proceed to conſider, in their order, the particles and other words which are to form the ſubject of the preſent Chapter.

SECTION FIRST.

ابا WITH.

This is another form of the word با, and it is difficult to determine which of the two is the ſource of the other. Thoſe who argue in favor of ابا obſerve, that it is more conſiſtent with the common uſage of every Language, to diminiſh than to augment the number of letters that may have originally belonged to any given word. Thoſe who maintain the oppoſite opinion, conſider that ابا is ſeldom uſed, but by the ancient Poets, who may have found it often convenient to form ابا from با, in order to fill up the meaſure of a verſe. Both denote the relation of Association, known in Grammar by the terms مَعِیَّت و مُصاحَبَت. Example:

آبا نیزه و تیر جوشن گذار " With ſpears and arrows penetrating armour ;" &c.

ابر ON.

THIS is another form of the words بر , and both denote the relation of EXALTATION, known in Grammar by the term استعلاء . Example: بشادی ابر تخت زرین نشست " He ſat down with joy on his throne of gold ;" &c. The word ابر ſeldom occurs, except in the works of the older Poets.

ابی WITHOUT.

THIS is another form of the word بی , and is of rare occurrence, except in the writings of the ancient Poets. Being oppoſed, in point of ſenſe, to the word با or ابا *With*, it denotes the abſence of that relation ſignified by the terms معیت و مصاحبت. Example: ابی او نباشیم در رزم شاد " We are unwilling to fight without him ;" (ROOSTUM ;) &c.

آخر AT LAST.

THIS is an Arabic word formed on the meaſure فاعل and ſignifies THE LAST or LATEST, as oppoſed to آخَر, Meaſure افعل, commonly uſed to ſignify OTHER ; LATTER ; &c. The word آخر, is therefore an active participle or an adjective noun, as این کتاب به آخر رسید " This book is finiſhed ;" در آخر روز از آنجا بر آمدم " I left that place at the cloſe of day ; &c. It is adverbially uſed by the Perſians, to ſignify AT LAST : as چندین ظلم می کنی آخر از خدا نمی ترسی " You that practice ſo much tyranny ! have you no fear of the wrath of GOD ?" &c. The ſenſe of the word آخر diſappears in my tranſlation, but the force of that word will be eaſily intelligible to thoſe who underſtand the true meaning of the ſentence, which is

is as follows. "There are many reafons againft the practice of tyranny, fuch as the infamy of its commission, the defolation it occafions, and the feelings of deteftation excited by it; but overlooking all thefe, I afk you AT LAST, or as the LAST and STRONGEST of thefe reafons, have you no fear of the wrath of GOD? a motive againft the practice of tyranny, fo powerful as to fupercede the neceffity of ftating any other." It is plain, therefore, that there is an ellipfis in every fentence of this nature, and that the word آخر fo ufed, implies the omiffion of all INFERIOR reafons, for the fake of the LAST or STRONGEST of them all. It belongs, not to the verb مي ترسي "Do you not fear AT LAST the wrath of GOD?" but to another verb underftood in the fentence; such as بگوي آخر "Tell me "at laft," or any other words to the fame effect.

ايدون آذون THUS and THUS.

THESE two words are of rare occurrence in the Language, being commonly fuperceded by the more familiar phrafe چنين و چنان "Thus and thus;" with which, indeed, they are exactly fynonimous. Example: تفكر كن تو اندر خلقت شاهين و مرغابي "Reflect on the nature of the hawk and the wild duck;" نگويي كز چه معني را است اين ايدون و آن آذون "You cannot tell why either has been created fuch as he is;" or "Why the one has been formed to prey on the other;" &c. The fenfe of the words كز چه معني را might be otherwife expreffed كز براي چه معني "For what end;" or "For what purpofe;" whence it follows that را is here ufed in the fenfe of the word براي *For.*

ار IF.

THIS is merely a contraction of the word اگر *If,* the nature of which will be fhortly explained. It feldom occurs, except in poetry, and then only in the middle of a line, where it

it may coalesce with the particle و *And,* forming in that case, the word وَر. Example: بنایی که محکم ندارد اساس "The building which is not strong in its foundations;" بلند مشمار آن ور کنی زو بهراس "Raise it not high, or if you do, fear that it will tumble into ruin." At the beginning of a line, the word گر (another contraction of اگر *If,*) commonly supercedes the word ار.

آرنگ APPARENTLY.

I believe this to be another form of the word رنگ *Color.* It has many acceptations which will be found in the Dictionary, but the following example from Rodŭkee will explain the only sense in which it requires to be noticed here. هرگز نکند سوی من خسته نگاه "She never deigns to cast an eye on her wretched lover;" آرنگ نخواهد که شود شاد دل من "Apparently she has no desire to render me happy." Some people here translate the word آرنگ by هرگز *Never:* "She never desires to render me happy:" but if it be another form of the word رنگ, I conceive *the former* translation to be the more accurate.

آری YES.

The word آری, though nearly synonimous with the word yes, has an acceptation somewhat more extended than that of the corresponding English word. It is employed for various purposes of Speech: as, *first,* to confirm the sense of any given proposition, whether affirmative or negative, that may have been uttered by another speaker. Examples: زید آمد "Zyde is come;" to which the person addressed may answer آری Yes; or آری زید آمد "Yes, Zyde is come." Or in the negative: زید نیامد "Zyde is not come;" to which the answer may still be آری Yes; or آری زید نیامد "Yes, Zyde is not come;" &c. It is plain, therefore, that the word آری may

may be employed to confirm the ſenſe of any propoſition, whether in the affirmative or negative form: whereas the word YES will neceſſarily *deſtroy* the negative, becauſe it is not good Engliſh to ſay, "Yes ZYDE is *not* come;" the word YES being here generally ſuperceded by NO. The difference between the word آری and the word YES, conſiſts therefore in this: that the former may coaleſce with a negative ſentence, which is not generally true of the latter: and this difference cannot be affected by any change in the form of the propoſition, which may be INFORMATIVE, as in the preceding examples: or INTERROGATIVE, as آیا زید نیامد "Is not ZYDE come?" Anſwer: آری NO: or IMPERATIVE, as شراب خور "Drink wine;" Anſwer: آری YES: or PROHIBITIVE, as شراب مخور "Do not drink wine;" Anſwer: آری NO: &c. &c.

BUT, *ſecondly*, the word آری like the word YES, may be accurately employed to *deſtroy* the negative compriſed in any given propoſition: as آری آمد "Yes he is come;" in anſwer to the words زید نیامد "ZYDE is not come;" or آیا زید نیامد "Is not ZYDE come?" &c. &c. How then are we to determine whether the word آری deſtroys or confirms the negative contained in any given propoſition, to which it may happen to be uttered as an anſwer? The reſolution of this queſtion is ſimple and eaſy. We muſt repeat the propoſition in every doubtful caſe: as آری آمد "Yes he is come;" in anſwer to the queſtion آیا زید نیامد "Is not ZYDE come?" &c. In either ſenſe of the word آری, the propoſition will, in fact, be generally found to follow that word; but in the event of its omiſſion, the word آری will confirm, and cannot deſtroy the negative or affirmative form in which the propoſition may have been firſt uttered. The word آری, ſtanding alone, muſt be therefore tranſlated by YES or NO, according to the

affirmative or negative ſenſe of the ſentence to which it may be uttered as an anſwer.

It only remains to be remarked of this word, that it may be accurately employed as a mere corroborative, like the word TRULY in our Language: as چشم گریان خیالی شد خراب آری ز اشک "The ſtreaming eyes of KHIALEE are deſtroyed by his tears;" می شود آری ز باران خانهٔ مردم خراب "Yes truly, the habitations of men are deſtroyed by the rain!" That it may alſo corroborate a negative ſentence, the following example will ſufficiently evince: زُهّاد را از عشرتِ رندان نصیب نیست "The devotees have no ſhare in the joys of the diſſolute;" (ſuch is the literal ſignification of the word رند, which here and elſewhere very commonly implies the SOOFEES, or thoſe who are devoted to the love of GOD;) آری بهر کسی ندهند این نواله را "True, every man is not deſtined to partake of thoſe joys!" &c.

از FROM.

It is peculiarly worthy of remark, that the Arabs have two prepoſitions, من FROM; and عن FROM; both of which are tranſlated by از. Yet theſe two prepoſitions are not at all ſynonimous; nay, they are ſo completely diſtinguiſhed in point of ſenſe, that the uſe of either to ſupply the place of the other, though not wholly unknown to the Language, muſt be conſidered as a rare occurrence. The word عن cannot be accurately employed for من, in the phraſe سِرْتُ مِنَ ٱلْبَصْرَةِ إِلَى ٱلْكُوفَةِ "I travelled FROM Buſrah to Koofa;" nor can the word من ſupply the place of عن, in the phraſe رَمَيْتُ ٱلسَّهْمَ عَنِ ٱلْقَوْسِ "I threw the arrow FROM the bow;" &c. In what, then, conſiſts the difference of

ſenſe

ſenſe between theſe two prepoſitions, both of which are commonly tranſlated by the ſame word, as well in the Perſian, as in the Engliſh Tongue?

We are told by the Arabian Grammarians that the word مِن denotes the BEGINNING OF A SPACE; (اِبتِداءِ غايت;) being directly oppoſed, in point of ſenſe, to the word اِلى To, which has been found to indicate the END OF A SPACE; (اِنتِهاءِ غايت.) Whence it follows, that the preceding example, سِرتُ مِنَ البَصرَةِ اِلى الكُوفَة "I travelled from Buſrah to Kooſa," might be thus rendered: "I travelled BEGINNING Buſrah; END Kooſa;" or, in other words, that the Arabian Grammarians have aſſigned to the word مِن, the very ſame ſenſe which Mr. TOOKE aſcribes to the word FROM. I believe, accordingly, that the word FROM is entirely ſynonimous with مِن, not عَن; yet عَن is very generally tranſlated by FROM, as in the Example رَمَيتُ السَهمَ عَنِ القَوسِ "I threw the arrow FROM the bow;" &c. Two queſtions occur, therefore, with regard to the nature of this example. *Firſt*, it may be reaſonably aſked why the example cannot be accurately rendered in Arabic by the word مِن? and, *ſecondly*, what is the true meaning of the word عَن, by which alone it can be accurately rendered?

Now the word مِن, like the word FROM, is ſignificant of the ſame idea with the word BEGINNING; and ſince the example in queſtion is rendered in Engliſh by the word FROM, "I threw the arrow FROM the bow, or BEGINNING the bow;" I can ſee no reaſon why it might not be accurately rendered in Arabic by the word مِن. But we know that it cannot be ſo rendered, and in the abſence of every better reaſon, I am compelled to account for the fact by a reference to the idiom

or

or common uſage of the Language, which here proſcribes the uſe of مِن . I admit however, that this is a very lame account of the matter, a ſort of cabaliſtical reſource to which the Grammarian, in his utmoſt perplexity, may be ſometimes, though rarely, permitted to refer.

IT remains to determine the true meaning of the word عَن , which is certainly not ſynonimous with مِن , or even with FROM, though both are often tranſlated by FROM. The word عَن denotes the relation of SEPARATION, known in Grammar by the terms اِنْفِصَال و مُجَاوَزَت , and ſeems to be exactly ſynonimous with our OFF. The phraſe رَمَيْتُ السَّهْمَ عَنِ الْقَوْسِ means, therefore, "I threw the arrow OFF the bow;" and as the word مِن cannot here ſupply the place of عَن , it follows that the uſe of FROM, in the example before us, is peculiar to the idiom of the Engliſh Language, and wholly inconſiſtent with that of Arabia. To this diverſity of idiom in the two Languages, the common tranſlation of عَن , which ſignifies OFF, by the word FROM, which has a different ſenſe, muſt, I believe, be invariably aſcribed. I now proceed to conſider the nature of the Perſian prepoſition اَز FROM.

I HAVE no doubt, that this prepoſition has the double force of عَن and of مِن ; and it is certain, at leaſt, that there is no other word by which either prepoſition can be accurately tranſlated into the Perſian Tongue. It has the ſenſe of مِن in the following example: اَز زَنْگْبَار تَا فَرَنْگِسْتَان سَفَر کَرْدَم "I travelled FROM Ethiopia TO Europe;" or "I travelled BEGINNING Ethiopia, END Europe;" but it is ſomewhat more difficult to ſhew its application in the ſenſe of the prepoſition عَن OFF. The example تِیر اَز کَمَان اَنْدَاخْتَم "I threw the arrow FROM the bow," will be obviouſly inſufficient for that purpoſe: *firſt,*

becauſe

because از is here commonly translated by FROM; and, *secondly*, because FROM is synonimous with من not عن. We must therefore endeavour to find another example of a less questionable nature, and the following, I believe, will answer the purpose.

بذکر حبیب از جهان مشتغل سعدی

" Wholly occupied by the contemplation of the DEITY, they are utterly careless of all the world !"

IT is to be observed that the word مشتغل, in the example before us, is obviously connected with two prepositions: بذکر حبیب مشتغل " Occupied by the love of the DEITY," از جهان مشتغل " They are careless of the world;" &c. Now the word مشتغل, abstractedly considered, signifies OCCUPIED, not CARELESS; yet it must be generally translated by the word CARELESS, when followed in Persian by the preposition از, or in the Arabic Language by the word عن. And the same effect may be observed to flow from the use of these prepositions, in combination with many other Arabic and Persian words: as for example; بکاری پرداختم " I engaged in a certain affair;" از کاری پرداختم " I disengaged myself from the same affair;" دران رغبت کردم ; رغبت فیه ; " I desired this;" از آن راغب شدم ; رغبت عنه ; " I did not desire it;" &c. &c.

IT is true, indeed, that the preposition از is not invariably expressed in every example of this nature: yet I remember no instance of its omission, except in the case of the verb پرداختن: as خانه پرداختم " I emptied the house;" and there I presume it might be supplied: خانه را از خود پرداختم " I emptied or disengaged the house from myself;" in which

case, it may be accurately considered as understood in the sentence.

Now I ask the reader how it happens that the Persian از, or the Arabic عن, is able to produce the effect to which I have just adverted, of reversing, apparently, the ordinary signification of the words with which they are here combined? And to this question, I conceive it is impossible to return any other than the following answer: *namely*, that both are here properly translated by OFF: that neither does, in reality, alter the ordinary sense of the words with which they are here combined: and that the phrase از کاری پرداختن (and so also of other examples) signifies "To engage OFF an affair;" which is the same thing as "To be disengaged from it." It is on this principle that we say in English (though the expression is merely colloquial, and may perhaps be accounted vulgar:) "He wished to engage me in a long argument, but I FOUGHT OFF; or, in other words, I would NOT fight the argument with him." The following is a summary statement of the inference to be drawn from these observations.

LET it be granted that the radical signification of the words رغبت, اشتغال, پرداختن, &c. is precisely the same in every example that can be adduced; and we must then admit, on the evidence of the preceding examples, that the Arabic عن signifies OFF, and that the Persian از is found occasionally to have the same sense. And this I contend to be much more reasonable than the other alternative, which requires us to believe that each of these words, combined with the prepositions از or عن, is, in reality, significant of the idea *directly opposed* to that which it is known to signify in every other case. To those who embrace the second alternative, who believe that the word رغبت, abstractedly considered, signifies at once DESIRE, and the contrary, (and so also of *the*

other

other examples,) I admit my inability to furnish any demonstrative evidence of the fallacy of their opinion; or, in short, any arguments on the subject stronger than those already adduced. I believe, however, that those arguments will be deemed sufficient, by the reflecting reader, to justify the conclusion drawn by me: *namely*, "that the word مِن signifies FROM; that the word عَن signifies OFF; and that the Persian اَز has the joint force of the other two."

I NOW proceed to detail the rules for the practical application of the word اَز to the purposes of speech; having first premised that though I believe the general sense of اَز to be such as I have stated, I will not undertake to reconcile to that general sense every possible example of its practical use.

RULE FIRST.

THE word اَز is very commonly employed to indicate the separation of a PART from the WHOLE, signified in Grammar by the term تَبعِيض TO DIVIDE, or TO SHARE. The word تَبعِيض is derived from بَعض SOME, which may, in this case, supply the place of the preposition اَز. Examples: "اَز نَصايِحِ حُكَمَا اَست هَرچِه دِير نَپايَد دِل بَستَگِى رَا نَشايَد" "It is an observation, or among the observations, or a *part* of the observations of the wise, that nothing is valuable which is not lasting;" "قَنَاعَت وَ عِفَّت اَز جُملَهٔ مَرضِيَّه اَست" "Contentment and purity are among the number of laudable qualities;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

IT is very commonly used to indicate the relation of EXPLANATION, known in Grammar by the term تَبيِين. In this case, the preposition اَز must follow some general term, denoting an idea which is to be defined, or rendered specific by means of one or more following

substantive

ſubſtantive nouns. Examples: آنچه فرمودی از زجر و ملامت "The reproaches uttered by you," or more literally, "What you ſaid conſiſting of reproach and cenſure; مناسب حال ارباب همت نیست is not conſiſtent with generoſity of ſpirit;" or "Does not accord with the uſual conduct of generous men." Of this nature are the examples: خاتمی از طلا دارم "I have a gold ring;" جامهای قیمتی از پشمینه و اطلس ختائی خریدم "I purchaſed valuable robes, conſiſting of woollen, and the ſilk of Khŭta;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

It may be employed to denote the relation of CAUSATION, known in Grammar by the terms تعلیل و سببیت. Example: ملک از داد آبادان شود "A country flouriſhes by the means of juſtice;" &c. Or the relation ſignified by the term بدل or EXCHANGE: as این اسب را از زر خریدم "I purchaſed this horſe for money;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It may indicate the relation ſignified *by the term* استعانت AID or ASSISTANCE; and will govern, *in that caſe*, a given ſubſtantive noun ſignificant of the MEANS or INSTRUMENT employed *in* the performance of a certain action. Examples: از قلم نوشتم "I wrote with a pen;" نان از عمل خویش خوردم "I earned my bread by my own induſtry;" &c. Or the relation ſignified by the term استعلا: in which caſe, it is convertible with the prepoſition بر ON. Example: از کوه بر آمد; or which is the ſame thing, بر کوه بر آمد "He aſcended the mountain;" از نفس خود بخل می کند or بر نفس خود بخل می کند "He is parſimonious even to his *own* perſon;" or "He practices parſimony ON his own *perſon*;" &c.

RULE

RULE FIFTH.

IT denotes the relation signified by the term فصل DISTINCTION; and will occur, in this case, between two nouns directly opposed to each other by sense. Example: گر کسی خاک مرده باز کند "If a man were to uncover the ashes of the dead," نشناسد توانگر از درویش "He would perceive no distinction between the poor and the rich;" or "He would not know the rich as distinguished from the poor."

RULE SIXTH.

IT supplies occasionally the place of the preposition در IN; denoting, in that case, the relation signified by the term ظرفیت. Example: پناهنده را یاد کرد از نخست (در نخست) "He thought on GOD, or addressed himself to GOD *in* the first place. Or the place of the word بعد AFTER: as ادیم از چهل روز گردد تمام (بعد چهل روز) "The Adeem (a species of scented leather) is prepared or becomes perfect in the course of forty days; or *after* forty days;" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

IT denotes the relation of APPROPRIATION, signified in Grammar by the term تخصیص, and commonly expressed by means of the IZAFUT, as already stated in the Chapter that treats of the GENETIVE CASE. Example: سپاس از خداوند خورشید و ماه or, which is the same thing, سپاس خداوند خورشید و ماه "All praise is due to the Lord of the Sun and the Moon;" &c. Of this nature are the examples پیش از ان ; پس از مدتی ; غیر از تو; &c. &c. where از supplies the place of the IZAFUT, according to the opinion of all Grammarians.

RULE EIGHTH.

IT may be employed, like the English word THAN, to

form the link of connexion between the مُفَضَّل and the مُفَضَّل عَلَيْه; the former being an adjective in the comparative degree. Example: زَيْد بِهْتَر اَز عَمْر اَسْت "ZYDE is better than AMR;" &c. (SEE CHAPTER ELEVENTH, PAGE 276 OF THIS VOLUME.)

RULE NINTH.

IT will be found, occasionally, to indicate a variety of other relations, the classification of which, I am compelled to abandon to the judgment of the reader. Examples: اَز حَكِيمِي پُرسِيدَم (حَكِيمِي را پُرسِيدَم) "I asked a philospher;" هَرْكَس صَدَقَه دِهَد اَز ذَاتِ خُود "Let every man give alms in his own behalf;" اَز كَسِي نِشَان نَيَافْتَم "I found no traces of any body;" اَز بَرَاي كَارِي بِجَايِي رَفْتَه بُودَم "I went on business to a certain place;" &c. In the last example, and in many others of the same nature, the word اَز may be considered, I imagine, as a mere PLEONASM.

RULE TENTH.

THE word اَز, in the following example, performs a double office: *first*, it forms a component part of the complex term اَز خَاطِرِ خُود رَفْتَن "To lose one's mind;" or "To be wholly absorbed in the contemplation of the DEITY;" and, *secondly*, it forms a connective equivalent to the word THAN, between the مُفَضَّل and the مُفَضَّل عَلَيْه. Example: دَوْلَتِي خُوبْتَر اَز خَاطِرِ خُود رَفْتَن نِيسْت "There is no happiness greater than that of him who is absorbed in the contemplation of GOD." The sense of the example might be thus expressed: اَز خَاطِرِ خُود رَفْتَن وَبِي خُود شُدَن دَوْلَتِي خُوبْتَر اَزِين نِيسْت; whence it is obvious that the word اَز, being once expressed, is afterwards omitted to avoid repetition.

CONCLUSION.

It is a remark of Mr. Tooke (Diversions of Purley, Vol. I, Page 346,) that Dr. Johnson has numbered up *twenty* different meanings of the word From, to which he has ſuperadded *twenty-two* other modes of uſing that word; ſupporting his opinion of its verſatile character by a phalanx of examples amounting to the number of Seventy or more. Yet Mr. Tooke truly affirms that the word From has but one ſenſe; *namely*, that ſignified by the word Beginning; which may invariably ſupply the place of From, in every example that can be adduced.

Now it was certainly the duty of Dr. Johnson to have aſcertained, if poſſible, that general ſenſe of the word From, for which we are indebted to the diſcoveries of Mr. Tooke; but admitting that he had ſucceſsfully performed that duty, it would be ſtill neceſſary to illuſtrate, by a variety of examples, the practical application of that word to the purpoſes of ſpeech. For the ſimple ſtatement of the fact, that the word from ſignifies the beginning, will not enable a man who is imperfectly verſed in the common uſage of the Engliſh Language, to determine the individual caſes or propoſitions in which that particle may be accurately employed; and the reaſon muſt be obvious to thoſe who duly appreciate the arbitrary influence of idiom, which unqueſtionably determines, in conjunction with the literal meaning of every word, the propoſitions to which it may be applied. To explain by examples.

They ſay in Perſian از قلم نوشتم; which is tranſlated into Engliſh "I wrote *with* a pen;" and ſo, alſo, they ſay زید بهتر از عمر است "Zyde is better *than* Amr;" where از is tranſlated by the word than. Now we cannot ſay in Engliſh that "Zyde is better from Amr;" or even that

"ZYDE wrote FROM a pen;" yet this is what the Persians say, since the word اَز, abstractedly considered, is properly translated by the word FROM. I ask, therefore, why both particles, being, as they are, synonimous terms, are not found to be invariably applicable to the same propositions? or in other words, why a Persian may accurately employ the word اَز in the same proposition which cannot be accurately rendered in English by the word FROM? The answer is obvious: *namely*, because the practical application of synonimous terms varies with the idiom of every Language; and as the operations of idiom are certainly arbitrary, it thence follows, that every Grammarian is bound to perform a double duty: *first*, to determine, with Mr. TOOKE, the true meaning of the word of which he has occasion to treat; and, *secondly*, to illustrate, with Dr. JOHNSON, (that is to say, by a variety of well chosen examples,) the practical application of the same word, as determined by the IDIOM of the Language to which it belongs.

THIS is the plan which I have hitherto pursued, and shall continue to pursue, in treating the particles of the Persian Language; and though, ignorant of Etymology, I must be sometimes in danger of falling into error, I shall have performed an acceptable service to Grammatical Science, if I can shew my successors, in distant perspective, the cheering prospect of future emancipation from the trammels of Etymology imposed by Mr. TOOKE. Not that I contemn the aid of Etymology, which unquestionably furnishes the best means to determine the meaning of individual words; but unfortunately, we cannot always have recourse to its aid, and, following the plan of the Arabian Grammarians, I aspire to demonstrate, in such cases, that the truth is attainable by other means.

OF the word اَز I have nothing more to observe, except that the letter *Alif* is sometimes omitted in writing, as كَز; وَز; نَز; for كِه اَز; وَاَز; نَه اَز; &c. and that the letter ز, moveable

by the vowel KŭSRA, is often employed for از, in order to preserve the measure of a verse.

ازیرا Because.

This word is generally contracted into زیرا, and sometimes into ازرا by ancient writers. It is probably a complex term, consisting of the three words: از این را or از برای این "For this reason;" in which case, the word را must be considered as a mere pleonasm. Admitting the accuracy of this etymology, which the reader will adopt or reject at pleasure, it follows that the letter *Noon*, of the word این, must have been rejected in process of time. It is generally followed by the particle که: (زیرا که:) but in poetry that particle is sometimes omitted, as for example: مجو دل را اگر گیرد غم نگردد "Let not your heart indulge in grief; ازیرا غم بجودن کم نگردد "Because grief is not diminished by indulgence." &c.

SECTION SECOND.

اگر If.

Mr. Tooke states that the word if, anciently written gif, is another form of the word give, which may always supply the place of if, in every example that can be adduced. Example: "If you beat me, I shall beat you." Resolution: "Give, you beat me, I shall beat you." Example: "Nay further, yet, they make her go,—In doubting if she doubts or no." Resolution: "Give she, she doubts or does not doubt, to this extent they make her carry her doubts;" &c. Now I admit the accuracy of this etymology, which is at once plausible, and well sustained by a variety of examples and illustrations adduced by Mr. Tooke. And the admirers of that eminent

writer have discovered in the word گیر GRANT, or more literally, TAKE, the fancied origin of the word گر, which is another form of اگر IF.

I HAVE already assigned some reasons (VOLUME II, PAGE 51,) why the accuracy of this etymology does not command my implicit faith: *first*, because I am not aware that گیر was anciently employed for گر, as GIF was anciently employed for IF; *secondly*, because گر, being merely poetical, is obviously a contraction of اگر IF; *thirdly*, because *it does not appear* that the letter *Alif* was ever prefixed to the Imperative گیر; and, *finally*, because گر with *Kusra*, not گر with *Futha*, is the most natural and analogous contraction of گیر; as may be observed on reference to other inflexions of the verb, such as گرفتن ; گرفتہ ; &c. On the other hand, I think it probable, on Mr. TOOKE's principles, that the words GIVE or GIVEN, GRANT or GRANTED, TAKE or TAKEN, &c. &c. may always supply the place of IF, in every example that can be adduced; and if the reader shall be therefore of opinion that گر is a corruption of the verb گیر, he is at liberty to determine the question according to the dictates of his own judgment, without regard to my incredulity, or that of the learned Native Grammarians with whom I have had occasion to converse on the subject. It remains to determine (if indeed I am able to determine,) the nature of those propositions to which the word اگر may be accurately applied.

THE word اگر is one of the حروف شرط; A CONDITIONAL PARTICLE, so called, because it must be generally followed by a جملۂ شرطیہ, or CONDITIONAL SENTENCE consisting of two members, *namely*, the شرط or CONDITIONAL MEMBER, and the جزا or CONSEQUENCE flowing from the شرط.

Example:

Example: اگر کار کنی مزد یابی "If you work, you shall obtain the reward of your labor;" &c. It is most naturally employed in cases of DOUBT, as in the preceding example; being opposed, in this respect, to the word چون WHEN, which is generally employed in cases of CERTAINTY. Example: چون صبح بدمد ازین جا کوچ کرده آید "When the morning breaks, (an event obviously of certain occurrence,) we shall march from hence;" &c. So far, it corresponds exactly with our IF; the simple unaccompanied utterance of which, will often excite the idea of DOUBT; as for example: "IF! thou protector of this damned strumpet, talk'st thou to me of IFS?" &c. Yet both are often rhetorically employed in cases of CERTAINTY, and I shall have occasion, in the course of the present chapter, to point out some of the principles on which the accuracy of such application seems to depend.

EVERY sentence following the word اگر IF, is not properly a conditional sentence; for, on the contrary, that word is often rhetorically employed to elevate into energy, the expression of some UNCONDITIONAL proposition comprised in the second member of the sentence by which it is followed: as for example: گر بنده می نوازی و گر تیغ می زنی "If you are favorable to me, or if you put me to death," ما بنده ایم و مصلحت ما رضای تست "I am still your slave, and your approbation is the only object to which I aspire." It must be obvious to the reader, that the poet's devotion to his mistress is here represented as wholly unconditional: it has no dependence whatever, on the mode of conduct that she may think proper to adopt towards him, and will subsist equally under the opposite extremes of favor and discouragement on her part. For a CONDITION, properly so called, indicates the terms on which a given event can alone take place: "If you do your work, (but not otherwise,) I shall

handsomely

handſomely reward your labour;" and according to the Arabic aphoriſm, إِذَا فَاتَ الشَّرْطُ فَاتَ الْمَشْرُوطُ "When the شَرْط is loſt, ſo is the مَشْرُوط," the abſence of the condition implies the abſence of the مَشْرُوط, or "That to which the condition was annexed."

Now a poet might certainly make the *favor* of his miſtreſs, the CONDITION of the continuance of his devotion to her; but it is not in the nature of things that any man ſhould beſpeak the *cruelty* of his miſtreſs as a condition, the non-adherence to which, on her part, would have the effect of putting an end to his admiration. And hence it follows, as already ſtated, that the preceding is not properly a conditional ſentence; the word اگر being here and elſewhere very commonly employed, on rhetorical principles, to elevate into energy the expreſſion of a given propoſition compriſed in the جزا, or ſecond member of the ſentence by which it is followed. Of this employment of the word اگر I ſhall ſhortly have occaſion to ſpeak more fully than is neceſſary in the preſent ſtage of the diſcuſſion.

EVERY CONDITIONAL SENTENCE muſt have a *reference to* paſt or future time; and though the Engliſh IF, and the Perſian اگر, are indifferently applicable in either caſe, ("If you beat me, I ſhall beat you;" "If you had beaten me, I would have beaten you;" &c.) the Arabs have invented two particles, *namely*, the word لَوْ, and the word إِنْ, (both tranſlated by اگر IF,) the one applicable to paſt time, and the other applicable to future time. I deem it neceſſary, therefore, to offer a few obſervations on the nature of theſe two Arabic particles.

THE Arabian Grammarians have entertained oppoſite opinions with regard to the true meaning of the word لَوْ; but the *point*

of

of difference muſt be conſidered as of little importance, notwithſtanding the nice and metaphyſical arguments employed by the writers on either ſide of the queſtion. The facts of the caſe are ſhortly as follows. The word لَوْ is very rarely applicable to any propoſition having a reference to future time, though ſome few examples of that kind are not wanting in the Language, ſuch as اُطْلُبِ الْعِلْمَ وَلَوْ بِالصِّينِ "Purſue knowledge, even if your purſuit ſhould extend to CHINA;" where لَوْ occurs in the ſenſe of إِنْ. Generally ſpeaking, it muſt be followed by two verbs in the paſt tenſe: لَوْ زُرْتَنِي اَكْرَمْتُكَ "If you had viſited me, I would have received you with honor;" and though the firſt verb may be ſometimes, though rarely, obſerved to aſſume the form of the AORIST, it muſt be ſtill tranſlated by the paſt tenſe, ſince the phraſe لَوْ تَزُورُنِي اَكْرَمْتُكَ is preciſely equivalent to the phraſe لَوْ زُرْتَنِي اَكْرَمْتُكَ "If you had viſited me, I would have received you with honor;" &c.

IN reality, therefore, the word لَوْ denotes the NEGATION of both members of the ſentence by which it is followed: for if it be affirmed that "If you had viſited me, I would have received you with honor," the ſpeaker obviouſly means to aſſert that "the viſit in queſtion did NOT take place, and that therefore he did NOT receive you with honor." This is the true criterion by which to determine the proper application of the word لَوْ; for, if the ſentence cannot be ſo tranſpoſed, the word لَوْ will not be employed; as in the phraſe: "IF they have done this deed my Lord," where the word IF muſt be rendered in Arabic by the word إِنْ.

So far, the Arabian Grammarians are unanimous in the opinion which they have formed of the true meaning of the word لَوْ; but the events compriſed in either member of the

ſentence by which it is followed, are connected by the relation of Cause and Effect: "Because you did not viſit me, Therefore I did not receive you with honor;" and hence a queſtion has ariſen among them, the object of which is to determine whether لَو denotes the negation of the Cause, which implies the negation of the Effect; or, vice verſa, the negation of the Effect which implies the negation of every poſſible Cause. It is unneceſſary to detail the fine ſpun arguments employed by the champions on either ſide of this very unimportant, nice and metaphyſical queſtion; and I proceed, therefore, to *conſider the true nature and meaning of the word* إِن.

The proper application of the word إِن may be eaſily inferred from the preceding obſervations on the true meaning of the word لَو. It is applied, in the ſenſe of If, to every propoſition which cannot be accurately expreſſed by means of the word لَو; and though commonly applicable to future time, it ſeems, (apparently at leaſt, if not in reality,) to have an occaſional reference to paſt time. *Example:* إِن قتل زيد عمرا وجب قصاصه "If Zyde ſlew Amr, he ought to ſuffer death;" &c. *Now the* word لَو cannot be accurately employed in this example, becauſe there is here no negation of the propoſitions compriſed in either member of the ſentence; and the ſpeaker, on the contrary, profeſſing his utter ignorance of the guilt or innocence of the accuſed party, means, ſimply, to ſtate an opinion that "In the event of his guilt, he certainly merits the puniſhment of death."

The uſe of the word لَو for إِن would therefore alter the ſenſe of the whole ſentence: لو قتل زيد عمرا وجب قصاصه "If Zyde had ſlain Amr, he would *then* have merited the puniſhment of death;" and here the negation certainly holds, becauſe the ſenſe of the phraſe is clearly equivalent *to the*

ſtatement

ſtatement of an opinion that "ZYDE did NOT ſlay AMR, and therefore did NOT merit death." And if we inſert a negative in both or either member of the ſentence, "If ZYDE had NOT ſlain AMR, he would NOT then have merited death," the word لو will be ſtill employed; and as two negatives make an affirmative, the ſenſe of the ſentence will then run thus: "Becauſe ZYDE ſlew AMR, therefore he did, in reality, merit death."

Now if it be true that the phraſe إن قتل زيد عمرا وجب قصاصه implies a reference to paſt time, it muſt be inferred that the Arabian Grammarians have miſtaken the true nature of the word إن, which is affirmed by them to be excluſively applicable to future time. But the ſecond member of the ſentence "ZYDE merits the puniſhment of death," contains an opinion expreſſed by the ſpeaker; and that opinion is not POSITIVE, but merely CONDITIONAL, becauſe he is ignorant of the guilt or innocence of the accuſed party. What then is the CONDITION on which the ſpeaker declares the accuſed party to be worthy of death? I anſwer, that it is not ſimply his guilt, but the *knowledge* of his guilt, on which an opinion of that nature can be accurately formed; for though he may be guilty in point of fact, it is wholly impoſſible that I can declare him to be worthy of death, unleſs his guilt ſhall be known to me. I conceive, therefore, that there is an ellipſis in every ſentence of this nature: "If it ſhall be proved to my ſatisfaction, or to the ſatiſfaction of others in whom I have confidence, that ZYDE ſlew AMR, then I ſay that he is worthy of death:" and, in this caſe, the Arabian Grammarians may poſſibly be right in the opinion which they have ſtated, that the word إن is properly reſtricted to future time.

I ADMIT however, that the fact is of little importance, and the reader will therefore determine the queſtion according to the dictates of his own judgment; obſerving, merely, that the

word

word إن is ſuppoſed to indicate "The mutual dependence, on each other, of two future events compriſed in either member of the ſentence by which it is followed:" or to ſpeak more accurately, "the dependence of one event upon the other:" as for example: إن جئتني اكرمتك "If you viſit me, I will receive you with honor;" where both verbs, though verbally put into the paſt tenſe, muſt be tranſlated by the future tenſe. It remains to offer a few obſervations on the nature of this dependence, which is ſuppoſed to exiſt, or to have exiſted, between the two members of every *conditional ſentence*, whether following *the word* إن *or the word* لو.

The events compriſed in either member of the ſentence are moſt commonly connected by the relation of CAUSE and EFFECT; as it happens in the phraſe اگر آفتاب بر آيد روز موجود شود "If the SUN ſhall ariſe, the day will appear;" where the riſing of the SUN is properly the سبب or true CAUSE of the appearance of day. But if, for this example, we ſubſtitute the phraſe اگر زر بدست آيد اسب بخرم "If I obtain money, I ſhall purchaſe a horſe," it muſt be *obvious to the reader, that the* سبب or true CAUSE of the purchaſe of the horſe is to be found in the convenience which I expect to derive from the ſervices of that valuable animal, and the acquiſition of money is not, therefore, the CAUSE of the purchaſe, but merely the شرط or CONDITION, without which it cannot be carried into effect. And if we reverſe the firſt example: اگر روز موجود شود آفتاب طالع گردد "If the day ſhall appear, the SUN will ariſe," the appearance of day will neither be the CAUSE, nor even the CONDITION of the riſing of the Sun, but ſimply the EFFECT of the preſence of that Luminary, who is himſelf the parent of day.

IT is plain, therefore, that the relation exiſting between the two

members

members of a conditional ſentence is merely that of the Dependence of one propoſition on the other, or moſt commonly of Mutual Conjunction; whence it happens that the شرط, or Firſt member of the ſentence, is known to Logicians by the term ملزوم, or "Thing accompanied by ſomething elſe;" and the جزا or Second member of the ſentence, by the term لازم, or "That by which the ملزوم is accompanied." But the examples of the third claſs (اگر روز موجود شود آفتاب طالع گردد) will be found, I believe, to be of rare occurrence in every Language; and, generally ſpeaking, it may be accurately affirmed that the relation exiſting between the شرط and the جزا is properly that of Cause and Effect; the term Cause being underſtood to extend to the شرط, as well as the سبب, according to the preceding explanation of thoſe very accurate and logical terms. And this relation of Cause and Effect muſt be generally ſupplied by the underſtanding of the reader, wherever it is not expreſſed in terms; as for example: "If you are a warrior, I am no coward;" a phraſe which implies a long ellipſis: "Do not believe that you can intimidate me, for if you talk to me of your warlike exploits, I deſire to inform you that I am no coward;" &c.

I shall now proceed to illuſtrate, by a few rules and examples of no great importance in my own eyes, the practical application of the word اگر If; but this word, having the double force of لو and of ان, it will be ſeldom neceſſary to notice the diſtinction of ſenſe exiſting between theſe two Arabic Particles, and I ſhall therefore conſider the word اگر as having the ſame ſenſe, (which is probably the fact,) whether applicable to paſt or to future time.

RULE FIRST.

The verbs comprifed in either member of a Conditional Sentence following the word اگر If, and having a reference to future time, will generally affume the form of the Aorist, or Future Tense. But I have fhewn on a former occafion, (Volume II, Page 340) that the Past and Present *tenfes* of the verb may often fupercede the future tenfe, in the cafe of a Conditional Sentence having a reference to future time. Example: اگر رفتی بردی و اگر خفتی مردی "If you go on, you are fafe, but if you fleep, you die;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

The word اگر If, is moft naturally employed in cafes of doubt; but it may be employed in cafes of certainty: and the accuracy of fuch application depends on certain Rhetorical Principles, the nature of which, (after furnifhing a few examples,) I fhall leave to be determined by the judgment of the reader, fince they cannot be fully treated here. Examples: اگر صبح بدمد ازین جا کوچ کرده آید "If the morning would break, we *might then march away*." *Here the* ufe of the word اگر indicates the anxiety and *impatience of the fpeaker for the early* occurrence of a given event, (namely, the breaking of the morning,) which he well knows to be of certain occurrence. اگر این خبر من صادق باشم از تو چندین زر بگیرم "If the information which I have now ftated be true, (and I know certainly that it is true,) I fhall expect fo much money from you." The hearer doubts the truth of the information, and therefore the fpeaker employs *If*.

اگر زید را پسر تو باشی چرا بدو رنج رسانی "If you are the fon of Zyde, why are you the occafion of fo much forrow to him?" The perfon addreffed is the fon of Zyde, and both parties are well aware of the fact. But he does not treat Zyde with the refpect which is due from a fon to his father, and

is

is therefore, in his turn, treated by the ſpeaker as a man who does not know that Zyde is his father, ſince he does not act according to his knowledge. This principle, termed تنزیل by Arabian writers, is of extenſive operation in every Language. It would be eaſy to multiply the number of theſe examples, but the preceding will ſuffice for every purpoſe of practical uſe.

RULE THIRD.

I have already ſtated that the relation exiſting between the شرط and the جزا is properly that of the dependence of one propoſition on the other, but there are many examples in which that relation is not properly expreſſed in terms, and muſt be ſupplied by the means of ellipſis. The following examples are of this nature. اگر تو امروز بر من احسان کردی من دیروز بر تو احسان نموده ام "If you have favored me to day, I favored you yeſterday." Supply the ellipſis: "If you think proper to boaſt of having favored me to day, I deſire you to remember that I can boaſt of having favored you yeſterday." اگر تو درد دهی درد نیست درمان است "If you inflict pain, it is not pain but pleaſure." Supply the ellipſis: "If you inflict pain, it will be unaccompanied by the ordinary conſequences of ſuch infliction, becauſe pain, inflicted by you, will change its nature, and be converted into pleaſure." سایه‌بان منعمان گر چتر سلطانی بود "If the rich are ſhaded by coſtly canopies," خوابگاه مفلسان جز سایهٔ دیوار نیست "The bedchamber of the poor is merely the ſhelter furniſhed by the walls in the ſtreet." Poverty is the boaſt of the Perſian Poets, and the preceding verſes are certainly not intended to rouſe the compaſſion of the reader for the ſtate of the wretched and forlorn poor. The ellipſis muſt be therefore ſupplied as follows: "If the rich are ſhaded by coſtly canopies, it ſignifies nothing to me who am poor, and require no canopy of any deſcription, other than the ſhelter furniſhed by the walls in the ſtreet," I ſhall not venture to multiply, further, the number of

of examples similar to these, which the reader will be able to form for himself at pleasure.

RULE FOURTH.

The word اگر, occurring in the sense of لو If, must be generally followed by two verbs in the continuative preterite, as stated in Rule Fourth, Page 330, et seq: of this Volume. Example: ترا اگر نمی دیدم چنین واله نمی شدم "Had I not seen you, I should have been less deeply in love than now I am." But, in this case, the continuative preterite is sometimes, though rarely, superceded by some of the other past tenses of the verb, in *either* member of a conditional sentence having a reference to past time. Examples: اگر دانستم که زید انسانیت ندارد بملاقاتش نمی رفتم "If I had known Zyde to be such a barbarian, I would not have gone to visit him;" اگر زید دستگیرم نمیکرد مرده بودم "If Zyde had not assisted me, I should have died;" &c. It is not true therefore, as stated in Page 332 of this Volume, that the continuative preterite is never superceded except in the جزا or second member of the sentence.

RULE FIFTH.

The word اگر, though commonly the first member of every sentence in which it occurs, may yet be occasionally inserted any where. Example: اگر تو بیائی or تو اگر بیائی or بیائی تو اگر "If you shall come, خرسند شوم it will give me pleasure," &c. Or it may be sometimes accurately omitted in poetry, if the measure of the verse shall happen to require it. Example: سخنش تلخ نخواهی دهنش شیرین کن "If you do not wish his words to be bitter, you must take the pains to sweeten his mouth;" &c.

RULE

RULE SIXTH.

The word اگر, compounded with چه and چند (اگرچند اگرچه) (ارچند ارچه گرچه) is properly tranflated by the word Although, which is certainly not a Conditional Particle, fince the fecond member of the fentence has not, in this cafe, any conceivable dependence on the firft. Example: مهیّا کند روزی مار و مور "He prepares food for the fnake and the ant," اگرچند بی دست و پایند و زور "Though thefe are without force, and without hands and feet;" &c. The word اگرچه is alone generally employed in profe, the other four compounds being generally or invariably reftricted to poetry.

CONCLUSION.

I have ftated that every fentence following the word اگر If, is not properly a conditional fentence; as for example: گر بنده می‌نوازی و گر تیغ می‌زنی "If you favor me, or if you put me to death," ما بنده‌ایم و مصلحت ما رضای تست "I am ftill your flave, and your approbation is the only object to which I afpire." But the reader may chufe to fupply an ellipfis: "If you favor me, it will not enhance, or if you put me to death, it will not diminifh, the ardor of my devotion to you;" &c. And even in this cafe, the fentence is not properly Conditional, becaufe it might be accurately transpofed as follows: "The ardor of my devotion to you is wholly independent of any condition whatever, and will fubfift, equally, under the oppofite extremes of favor and difcouragement on your part." So, alfo, in the following example: جعل خود همان قدر دارد که هست "A beetle will be ftill a beetle" اگر در میان شقایق نشست "Even if it fhall take up its abode among flowers;" becaufe the fenfe of the fentence might

might be thus transposed: "Nothing, not even its residence among flowers, will be able to operate a change in the filthy and worthless habits of the beetle, which are so intimately interwoven with the very nature of the insect, that they cannot be eradicated by any possible means." Or, in the following example: اگر مجنون بدرد و داغ عشق افتد یک چندی "If MUJNOON suffered for a time the torments of love," ولی در عاشقی هرگز چنین کاری نیفتادش "Yet never did he suffer such misery as mine;" because the sense of the sentence might be thus rendered: "The pangs inflicted by LOVE, on his votary MUJNOON, however great they may have been, are beyond all comparison inferior to those which I have sustained under the lash of the same powerful and capricious DEITY."

IF it be affirmed, therefore, that "If you come to me, I will NOT give you money," the conditional character of the sentence will depend entirely on the meaning of the speaker: for if the speaker means to affirm, that "He will NOT give money, whether the person addressed shall come to him or not," (Even if you come, or Though you come, or Whether you come or not, I will not give you money,) then the sentence is not properly CONDITIONAL; and, on the contrary, if it be meant to affirm that "The coming of the party addressed will operate as a CAUSE to prevent the giving of money which will be otherwise paid," then the sentence is truly CONDITIONAL in the strict and proper sense of the term. And in my opinion, the word اگر is most properly followed by a Conditional Sentence, being otherwise employed, on rhetorical principles, in the sense of اگرچه ALTHOUGH, whenever the two members of the sentence by which it is followed, are not properly CONDITIONAL; that is to say, whenever they are not connected by the relation of CAUSE and EFFECT.

IN

In Page 333 of this Volume, I took occasion to observe that the phrase اگر گناه از دست او صادر شد "If the crime was indeed committed by him," سزاوار قتل بود "He was then worthy of the punishment of death," is not accurate; for some reason, as I there stated, connected with the sense of اگر If. I am disposed, on farther reflexion, to believe that the accuracy of the phrase in question must be admitted, because I can discover no sound principle on which it can be reasonably condemned. In the Arabic Language, the phrase إنْ قَتَلَ زَيدٌ عَمرًا وَجَبَ قِصَاصُهُ would signify "If Zyde slew Amr, he *is* worthy of death;" though both verbs are here put into the past tense. And if we substitute *was* for *is* in this example, it would then, I suppose, be rendered as follows: إنْ قَتَلَ زَيدٌ عَمرًا كَانَ قِصَاصُهُ حَقًّا "If Zyde slew Amr he *was* worthy of death;" though even in that case, I am of opinion that the phrase is by no means free of ambiguity. For in fact, it means that "If Zyde slew Amr, his death by retaliation *will* then be just;" and this is equally true before and after the period of the infliction of punishment by the law of retaliation. Nor do I know any possible means by which the sense of past time, signified in this example by the word *was*, can be clearly and unequivocally expressed in the Arabic Language; a fact, if true, for which I conceive there must be some reason in the nature of things, though I have not been able to discover it.

It only remains to be remarked, that the preceding observations on the nature of the word اگر If, are offered to the consideration of the reader with the conscious diffidence of a man who is well aware of the difficulty of the subject, and of the consequent probability that he may have been led into error; of one who does not, indeed, believe that the word اگر is a corrupted imperative of the verb گِرْ, but is not therefore disposed to impeach the judgment of those who may differ in opinion

opinion from him. I now proceed to illustrate, in a few words, the nature and application of the word ألا Ho! Have a care!

ألا Ho! Have a care!

This word has been borrowed from the Arabs, and is of common occurrence in the Persian Language. It is termed, by Grammarians, کلمهٔ تنبیه "An admonitory word;" and seems to belong to the class of Interjections, on the downfal of which, according to Mr. Tooke, the dominion of Speech has been erected. Its origin has been traced by certain Etymologists to the Arabic negative لا not, *and the Arabic Interrogative* همزهٔ استفهام; that particle being employed in the sense signified by the term استفهام انکاری, as explained in Page 114 of this Volume. In this case, it combines the force of a double negative; *namely*, that signified by the word لا, and that obtained by means of the استفهام انکاری; and both together make an affirmative, which corroborates the sense of every sentence to which it may happen to be occasionally annexed. Be that as it may, the word ألا generally occurs at the beginning of a sentence, being followed by a noun in the vocative case; or, in its absence, by the tenses of a verb in the second person. Example: ألا اى خسرو مسند فرخنده خوى "Have a care! you who are wise and of a good disposition;" ألا تا درخت کرم پروری "Have a care that you nourish the tree of generosity;" ألا اى که بر خاک ما بگذری "Ho! you who pass over my ashes;" &c. &c.

إلّا Except.

This Arabic word is termed in Grammar a حرف استثنا or Particle of Exception; and governs the مستثنى or "Thing excepted:" as ما همه خوانده را هم فراموش کرده ایم "I have

forgotten

forgotten all thatever I learned," الا حدیث دوست که تکرار می کنم " Except the remembrance of my Beloved, which alone occupies my whole ſoul." The مستثنی منه is That from which ſomething is excepted; and is here compriſed in the phraſe آنچه خوانده ام, " All that I learned." As a particle of exception, this word is nearly or entirely ſynonimous with the Perſian word مگر, to be conſidered hereafter, and to which the reader is therefore referred.

اما But.

Mr. Tooke ſtates that the Engliſh word But has a double ſenſe; firſt, that of the ancient Bot; and ſecondly, that of the ancient But. According to this hypotheſis, the word Bot, now improperly corrupted into But, is the imperative of an Anglo-Saxon verb, Botan, To ſuperadd, To ſupply, To ſubſtitute, &c. and theſe verbs may accordingly ſupply the place of Bot, (or of But uſed in the ſenſe of Bot,) in every example that can be adduced. Example: " You pray, but (add) it is not that God would convert you to the true religion, but (add or *ſubſtitute) that he would* confirm you in your own." The ancient But, is alſo an imperative, derived, however, from another verb; namely, Beon outan, To be out; into which, therefore, it may be accurately reſolved in every example that can be adduced. Example: " All but one are of the ſame opinion;" or " All, one being out, or be out one, are of the ſame opinion;" &c. In the phraſe, " I ſaw but two plants," there is therefore an omiſſion of the negative; " I ſaw no plants but two; or be out two; and this negative, commonly ſupplied by ancient writers, is often retained even in our days. Such is the ſimple, and probably accurate account, which Mr. Tooke has furniſhed of the word But; and I anticipate, I believe, the judgment of my readers, in admitting its ſuperiority over any that I am able to offer of the correſponding particles in the Perſian Tongue.

The Perſians have borrowed from the Arabs two particles, namely, the word اَمّا and the word لیکن, both tranſlated by the word But. Theſe two particles are not at all ſynonimous, though the Perſians are found occaſionally to employ اَمّا in the ſenſe of لیکن, an accident, I believe, which never happens in the Arabic Tongue. They are neither of them capable of expreſſing the idea ſignified by the ancient But, (Be out,) and it ſeems to me, that they divide between them the true meaning of the word Bot. By which I mean to affirm, that if we allow for ſome variety of application, occaſioned by the diverſity of idiom in either Language, according *to the principle ſtated in* Page 439 *of this* Volume, *the ſpecific* propoſitions, expreſſed in our language by But uſed in the ſenſe of Bot, will be generally expreſſed, in the Perſian Tongue, by one or other of the particles اَمّا or لیکن to which I have now adverted. The meaning of the word لیکن will be ſlightly treated in this chapter, and more fully conſidered in its proper place. I proceed, therefore, to make my readers accquainted with the ſingular opinions formed by the Arabian Grammarians on the nature and meaning of the word اَمّا.

The word اَمّا may be accurately employed at the beginning of a diſcourſe, like the word And in our language, which ſeems, in this caſe, to refer to ſome ideas previouſly afloat in the mind of the ſpeaker; as for example: "And whoſe immortal hand could ſhed. Upon this diſk the oceans bed!" "And did he love ſo fond ſo true, Without one cheering hope in view!" "And ſaid I that my limbs were old, And ſaid I that my blood was cold;" &c. But the word And, ſo uſed, never occurs except in poetry or impaſſioned eloquence; and the reaſon of its occurrence will be obvious, I think, to thoſe who conſider the enthuſiaſm of poetry, and the nature of thoſe impetuous feelings which uſually give birth to the ſudden burſts of animated proſe.

The occurrence of the word أمّا at the beginning of a diſcourſe, cannot be accounted for on the ſame principle; becauſe it is not the property of the poet and the orator, but the ordinary drudge of mere common ſpeech. The phraſe أمّا زيدٌ فكاتبٌ "But Zyde is a writer," is perfectly accurate in the Arabic Language, though nothing precede the word أمّا, either expreſſed or underſtood in the ſentence. And ſo, alſo, the phraſe أمّا بعد حمد الله ذي الإنعام "But after praiſes to God the giver of bounty," occurs with perfect accuracy at the beginning of the مصباح, which is not an oratorical performance, but ſimply a treatiſe on the moſt frigid of all imaginable ſubjects, namely, the ſyntax of Arabic Grammar. What then is the meaning of the word أمّا, as it occurs in theſe and other ſimilar examples?

In order to determine this point, the Arabian Grammarians have recourſe to a palpable fiction; ſuch as the European reader will never be brought to digeſt or admit. They ſuppoſe أمّا to be formed from the word مهما "Whenever;" the latter being firſt changed into ماما, and ſubſequently into أمّا, by diſarranging the primary order of the letters. The phraſe أمّا زيدٌ فمنطلقٌ "But Zyde is going," is ſuppoſed therefore according to this hypotheſis, to have been originally expreſſed in the following form: مهما يكن من شيءٍ فزيدٌ منطلقٌ "Whenever any thing happens," or according to Engliſh idiom, "Let what will happen, Zyde is going;" and thus, after digeſting the not very dexterous operation by which أمّا is reſtored to the imaginary primitive form of مهما, we have ſtill to ſupply the words يكن من شيءٍ, before the ſentence becomes intelligible.

I have not the leaſt faith in the accuracy of any part of this long proceſs; but I believe, nevertheleſs, on the authority of all the Arabian Grammarians, that the phraſe أمّا زيدٌ فمنطلقٌ "But

Zyde

ZYDE is going," implies a ſtronger aſſertion than the more ſimple phraſe زَيْدٌ مُنْطَلِقٌ "ZYDE is going," and conſequently that the word أَمَّا, in one ſenſe of the term, is employed to denote "the greater certainty of a given propoſition," a ſenſe which has been alſo aſcribed by ſome Engliſh writers, to the word BUT. To the queſtion, "How does it happen to denote the greater certainty of a given propoſition?" I am compelled to reply that I cannot tell; ſince the preceding is the only account of the word أَمَّا, ſo employed, which has been recorded by the writers on Arabic Grammar. Thoſe who are diſpoſed to believe that account, will neceſſarily *infer, with the writers in* queſtion, that the word أَمَّا is properly شَرْطِيَّة or CONDITIONAL; being another form of the word مَهْمَا, and therefore requiring the particle فَ, (أَمَّا زَيْدٌ فَمُنْطَلِقٌ) which is commonly prefixed to the جَزَا, or ſecond member of a conditional ſentence.

BUT the word أَمَّا is alſo employed to indicate the relation ſignified by the term تَفْصِيل or DETAIL; in which caſe, it muſt follow a general propoſition, which *is to* be detailed, or rendered *ſpecific, by two or more* ſubſequent propoſitions, each following the word أَمَّا, *which* muſt, therefore, be repeated in the ſentence. Example: همه اهل کمال اند "They are all men of eminent acquirements;" امّا یکی عالم است "But one of them is a man of learning;" واما دوم شاعر است "*And another* is a poet;" واما سیوم نثار است "And the third is an eminent writer in proſe;" &c.

IN theſe two ſenſes, the word أَمَّا is of common occurrence in the Arabic Language; but the Perſians are not unfrequently found to employ that word in the ſenſe of لٰكِن BUT, an accident which never happens in the Arabic Tongue.

In

In this caſe, it denotes the relation ſignified by the term اِسْتِدْرَاک ; and is commonly inſerted between two propoſitions, directly oppoſed to each other by ſenſe, " for the purpoſe of removing, by the ſecond propoſition, a ſuſpicion engendered on hearing the firſt:" this being the ſenſe of the term اِسْتِدْرَاک, as explained by the writers on Arabic Grammar. Example: زَیدْ آمَد اَمّا عَمْر نَیامَد for زَیدْ آمَد لیکِن عَمْر نَیامَد " ZYDE came, but AMR did not come." Or, to furniſh the authority of the Poet KHOSRO: بِسیار خُوبان دیده اَم اَمّا تو چیزی دیگری " Many are the beauties that I have ſeen, but your beauty is of another kind;" &c. I have nothing more to obſerve on the nature and application of the word اَمّا to the purpoſes of ſpeech.

اَنْدَر، اَنْدَرُون. WITHIN.

THE word اَنْدَر ſeldom occurs, except in poetry, and is otherwiſe ſynonimous with the ZURF اَنْدَرُون WITHIN, which is derived from it, and is of common occurrence in every ſpecies of Perſian compoſition. It is generally followed by a ظَرف or " Noun ſignificant of time or place:" as زَید اَنْدَر خانه اَست or more commonly زَید اَنْدَرُون خانه اَست " ZYDE is in the houſe;" but this order is ſometimes, though rarely, reverſed in the Language: as خانه اَنْدَر ; زار اَنْدَر ; &c. and the reverſed order muſt be adopted, if the ظَرف ſhall be governed by the prepoſition بِه : as بِجام اَنْدَر " In the Cup;" بِخانه اَنْدَرُون " Within the houſe. Example: دَریا رَوَد از چَشمَم لَب تَر نَشَوَد هَرگِز " Rivers flow from the fountain of my eyes, yet my parched lips imbibe no moiſture;" اِین طُرفه تَماشا بِین لَب تِشنه بِآب اَنْدَر " Behold therefore the ſingular ſpectacle of a lip-thirſty lover immerſed in the water." The word اَنْدَرُون, itſelf a ZURF, is neceſſarily followed by the mark of the IZAFUT, which

is not true of the word اَنْدَر. The word اَنْدَر, compounded with پِدَر ; مادر ; خواهر ; برادر ; indicates the relation signified by the term غَيْرِيَّت : as پِدَر اَنْدَر "A father in law," or "Unreal father;" مادر اَنْدَر "A mother in law;" برادر اَنْدَر "A half brother;" خواهر اَنْدَر "A half fister;" &c.

اَنْدِيك PERHAPS; BECAUSE; &c.

THOUGH Perfian Lexicographers confider the word اَنْدِيك to be uncompounded, there is fome reafon to fufpect *that it* is in reality formed from اَنْد or اَنْدِي *; by* adding the ordinary particle كِ, as in the cafe of شايَدكِ ; بايَدكِ ; or بُوَدكِ ; often contracted into بُوكِ ; &c. For the words اَنْد or اَنْدِي are ftated in fome dictionaries to have the fenfe of HOPE; or of SPEAKING WITH DOUBT; whence the Infinitive اَنْدِيدَن "To fpeak doubtfully of any given fubject." Of the occurrence of اَنْدِيك in Perfian compofition, the following examples will here fuffice: اَنْدِيك فَلَك دانَد قَدْرِ وَخَطَرِ تُو "Perhaps the heavens are apprized of your value;" با آنكه مَن اَزْ عِشْقِ تُو رُسْوايِ جَهانَم "Though my love for you has deftroyed my *reputation*," غَم را ضَيم اَنْدِيك تُو زيباي جَهانِي "I am willing to fuffer, fince (or becaufe) you are the moft beautiful woman in the world;" &c. From اَنْد in the fenfe of SOME, is alfo derived the word اَنْدَك FEW OR LITTLE.

ايرا BECAUSE; THEREFORE.

I HAVE already noticed the occurrence of this word, which is another form of زيرا ; اَزيرا BECAUSE; OF FOR THIS REASON. Example: مَن جَوْهَرِيِ مُفْلِسَم ايرا مُشَوَّشَم "I am a poor and pennylefs jeweller, and therefore perplexed or uneafy;" &c.

I observe the word اَزِيرا is sometimes spelt اَزِيرا in the SHAH NAMA, which is in favor of the etymology formerly proposed by me.

اَيضاً ALSO.

THIS is properly an Arabic infinitive in the accusative case, governed by its own verb آض, يَئيضُ, آيضً, TO RETURN; and the sentence, completed, would therefore run as follows: يَئيضُ اَيضاً "It returns a returning;" but the verb understood, is never expressed in the common usage of the Arabic Tongue. In Arabic and Persian books, it must be generally translated by the word ALSO, and is nearly synonimous with the Persian نِيز ALSO, which will be duly considered in its proper place.

اَی O! or NAMELY.

As a vocative particle, the use of the word اَی has already been explained, in VOLUME SECOND, PAGE 210 OF THIS WORK. It is employed by the Arabs, and sometimes, though rarely, by the Persians also, as a حَرفِ تَفسِير or "Particle of detail;" in which case, it corresponds nearly with the word يَعنِی IT MEANS; or NAMELY; as دِی رُوز فُلان اَی زَيدُ بِمَن آمَد "Yesterday such a person, namely ZYDE, came to me."

اَلحَمدُ لِلّٰه اِمروز بِمَقصُود رَسِيدَم اَی با زَيد مُلاقِی شُدَم "I thank GOD, I have this day accomplished my wishes; that is to say, I have met with ZYDE."

SECTION THIRD.

بَا WITH.

THIS is another, and the most common form of the word اَبَا WITH, as already stated in PAGE 425 OF THIS VOLUME.

The

The few obſervations that occur on the ſubject of its application to the purpoſes of ſpeech, are ſhortly detailed in the following rules.

RULE FIRST.

The word با denotes the relation of ASSOCIATION, known in Grammar by the terms مَعِیَّت و مُصاحَبَت. Examples: زید با لباسِ پاکیزه است " ZYDE is well dreſſed;" بکر با خِرَد است " BUKR is wiſe;" خدا با ما است " GOD *is with us;*" زید با عمرو بکر را کشتند " ZYDE, *together with* AMR, killed BUKR;" &c. I do not imagine that the word با has any real fluctuations of ſenſe, and the examples to be detailed in the following rules, will therefore be found, in all probability, to be accurately referable to the relation of ASSOCIATION, as already explained in this rule.

RULE SECOND.

The word با, occuring between a common ſubſtantive and the name of an event, is uſually a contraction for با وجود or با حدوث " In the preſence of;" *being* generally, though not invariably, in that caſe, tranſlated by the words THOUGH or NOTWITHSTANDING. Examples: زید با مُردنِ بکر دل تنگ نشده " ZYDE is little affected by the death of BUKR, or notwithſtanding the death of BUKR;" زید با زوال شدنِ مرض انوز تن درست نشده "ZYDE, notwithſtanding the removal of his complaint, has not yet recovered his health;" &c. Or to furniſh the authority of the Poet SULMAUN: با آنکه رفت در سرِ عشقِ تو جانِ من " Though or Notwithſtanding my ſoul has been deſtroyed by its love for thee," جانم انوز در سرِ عشقِ تو وقفِ تست " Yet ſtill is it wholly devoted to thee." In all theſe examples, the word با might be accurately ſuperceded by با وجود or با حدوث.

RULE THIRD.

THE word با is occasionally found to occur in many of the senses which I have already ascribed to the preposition بر. (SEE PAGE 392 ET SEQ: OF THIS VOLUME.) Examples: با او گفتم "I said to him;" با جان خریدار توام "I will purchase thee at the expence of my soul;" or "I will give my soul for the possession of thee;" با خانه رفتم "I went to the house;" با قلم نوشتم "I wrote with a pen;" &c.

باری ONCE; OR ANY TIME.

THIS is the word بار followed by the letter یای وحدت or یای تنکیر. Example: چو باری فتادی نگهدار پای "When you have once fallen, take care of your feet;" که تا بار دیگر نلغزد ز جای "That they may not stumble a second time." In its common acceptation, it occurs in the sense of the word الغرض "In short," or "In substance;" and seems, like the word آخر (SEE PAGE 426 OF THIS VOLUME,) to indicate "the omission of matter of inferior moment, for the sake of sooner coming to the point." In this point of view, it has been termed by the Persians کلمهٔ اقناعی; a phrase which I cannot easily translate, though the meaning will be obvious to the reader who considers that اقناع is derived from قناعت CONTENTMENT. In the common course of translation from the Persian Language into our Tongue, the force of the word باری will often disappear; yet it may, I believe, be accurately translated in its proper sense "At once," or "At any time," in almost every example that can be adduced. Examples: سلام علیک انوری کیف حالک "My compliments to you, ANWUREE, how do you do?" مرا حال بی تو نه نیک است باری "For truly my condition is but indifferent in your absence."

 کنند

آنانکه بتیر غم جان زخمت بلا کشند "Those who are appalled by the arrow of affliction," بادی حدیث عشق و محبت چرا کشند "Why do they presume to talk of Love!" &c.

باز AGAIN; &c.

THE application of this word is very various, and as I can offer no reasonable account of its origin or history, I shall merely furnish the reader with one or two examples of its occurrence in the Language, whether in the character of a noun or a particle. Examples: در باز کردم "I opened the door;" پوست باز کردم "I stripped off the skin;" باز گفتم "I again said;" از آن جا باز گشتم "I returned from thence;" از ان کار باز آمدم "I desisted from that affair;" باز خانه شدم "I returned," or simply, "I went to the house;" باز او گفتم, sometimes contracted into بزو گفتم, for با او گفتم "I said to him;" &c.

بر ON, or NEAR.

IN the sense of NEAR, the word بر is necessarily followed by the IZAFUT: as بر من آمد or بر من آمد "He approached me;" or "He advanced near me;" and in this sense, it must be assigned, like the word نزد or نزدیک NEAR, to the class of the ظروف مبهمه, as explained in PAGE 124, OF THIS VOLUME. Perhaps, according to Mr. TOOKE's principles, it may, in this case, be accurately referred to the substantive بر THE BOSOM; though the fact, according to my judgment, is unimportant even if it be true.

THE word بر, in the sense of ON, is very rarely followed by the IZAFUT, though some examples of that kind are not wanting in the Language: such as نشست از بر تخت پیروزه شاه.

"The

" The King sat down on his throne of emeralds;" بکیان آتش بر شده تابناک " The region of fire was exalted on high;" میان آب و باد از بر تیره خاک " And the water and the atmosphere were placed in the middle, just over the earth;" (and consequently under the region of fire;) &c. In this case also, the word بر, synonimous with بالا or فوق Above, must be assigned to the class of the ظروف مبهمه as already explained. Whether the ordinary omission of the Izafut, after بر in the sense of On, does or does not destroy the self-significant character of that word, is more than I shall venture to determine; but this at least is certain, that the Persian Grammarians regard it as a noun whenever it is followed by the mark of the Izafut, and as a particle, in the absence of that mark. As a particle, (whether accurately or otherwise,) it is my intention to consider it here; and such observations as occur on the subject of its application to the purposes of Speech, are detailed, accordingly, in the following Rules.*

RULE FIRST.

The word بر On, denotes the relation of exaltation, signified in Grammar by the term استعلا.

* The words In and On, in our Language, are sometimes nouns of the class termed ظروف, and sometimes particles, in my opinion. They are nouns wherever they are Selfsignificant; as "Come in;" "Put on," (your hat;) &c. and they are particles wherever they are Consignificant; as "Come in two days;" "Come on Friday next;" &c. This seems to be a clear distinction, and the reader who admits it, will recognise at once the principle on which the Persian Grammarians have assigned the word بر, followed by the Izafut, to the class of nouns; and the same word to the class of particles, whenever the Izafut happens to be omitted. That the Persian در In, is also occasionally employed as a noun, the following example from Saudee, in which that word is necessarily followed by the mark of the Izafut, will be considered as sufficient evidence: نگه کرد موری در غله دید " He looked and beheld an ant in the grain;" for such is the reading of the best copies of the Boostaun, though some have it در آن غله, which is less elegant in my opinion.

Examples:

Examples: بر اسپ سوار شدم "I mounted a horse;" بر سرش کلاه گران بها ست "He has, on his head, a cap of high price;" &c. And in this ſenſe, it may be metophorically employed for many various purpoſes of Speech. Examples: بر من هزار روپیه فلان است "I owe ſuch a man a thouſand rupees;" or "That ſum of money is on my head;" این دلیل برای شما نیست بلکه بر شما ست "The argument is not FOR you, but ON OR AGAINST you;" تفقد بحال فقرا بر اغنیا است "It is (incumbent) ON the rich, to enquire into the ſtate of the poor;" بکام روز بر بنده دل بسوخت "My heart one day felt for a ſlave;" &c. It is poſſible, indeed, that all the examples about to be detailed in the following rules, may be accurately referred to the relation of EXALTATION, as already explained in this rule. I do not, therefore, poſitively affirm that the word بر has any real fluctuations of ſenſe; and leave the queſtion to be determined by the judgment of the reader, after the examples of its application ſhall be fully before him.

RULE SECOND.

IT has been ſuppoſed to indicate the relation of ASSOCIATION, known in Grammar by the terms معیت و مصاحبت, and more commonly expreſſed by the prepoſition با WITH. Example: بر بیوفائی تو را ه وفا می سپم "With all your inconſtancy, I ſtill perſiſt in my fidelity to you." Or the relation of CONFORMITY known in Grammar by the term مطابقت; in which caſe, بر has the ſenſe of بر وفق ACCORDING TO. Examples: این جامه بر قامت زید دوخته شد "This garment was made to fit ZYDE;" این کار بر مذهب فلان می کنم "I do this according to the principles of ſuch a man;" سخن را بر مزاج مستمع گوی "Speak according to the diſpoſition of your hearer;" &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

It denotes, occasionally, the relation signified by the term ظرفیت; and more commonly expressed by the preposition در, In. Examples: بر وقت آمدم "I came at (or in) the proper time;" خواب شیرین چون کند او را که سودا بر سر است "How should he sleep who is mad with love!" &c. Or the relation of Causation, known in Grammar by the term تعلیل; in which case, the word بر will be generally convertible with the preposition از, or the word جهت. Example: بر غضب تو ازین جای روم "I leave this place on account of your anger; &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It denotes, occasionally, the relation of junction, or proximity, known in Grammar by the term الصاق, and often expressed by the word نزد, or the preposition به. Example: بر زید گذر کردم, or (with the Izafut) بر زید گذر کردم, or بر نزد زید گذر کردم, "I passed by Zyde;" &c. Or the relation (signified by the preposition به) which is detailed in Rule Fifth, Page 393 of this Volume. Example: این کتاب بر نام شما نوشتم "I have written this book in your name;" or "I have dedicated this book to you;" &c. Or the relation (whatever it may be) comprised in the following example, where بر is convertible with the preposition از. از من راضی شد or بر من راضی شد "He became satisfied with me."

CONCLUSION.

The preceding Examples will sufficiently illustrate the com-

mon acceptation of the word بر On, considered as a preposition applicable to the following substantive noun; but that word is very frequently compounded with the infinitive or tenses of a Persian verb; in which case, it may be sometimes a pleonasm: as برافراخت "He raised;" برافروخت "He kindled;" &c. and sometimes significant: as برداشت "He took up;" برآورد "He brought up; or extracted;" برکشید "He drew forth;" and many other examples, too numerous to be inserted in any Grammatical treatise whatever. For these, and for the various senses of the word بر considered as a common substantive noun, or as a ظرف employed in the sense of Near, the reader is therefore referred to the Dictionary. I now proceed to offer a few observations on the nature and application of the word بس.

بس Much; Many; Often; Enough; &c.

This word is properly significant of Abundance, being nearly synonimous with the word بسیار Much or Many, and has no real fluctuations of sense, though variously translated according to the examples in which it may happen to occur. Examples: بس نامور بزیر زمین دفن کرده اند "Many a man of celebrity has been buried in the earth;" بس مرغ همایون که به تیر نظر افت و "What a very noble bird has been killed by the glance of your eye;" ترا این قدر تا بمانی بس است "This (property which you possess) is sufficient for you while you remain here, or in this world;" بس کن ز حدیث عشق بس کن "Speak no more of love, I pray you, enough;" ما همه فانی و بقا بس ترا "We are all mortal, and to thee alone (the Deity) belongs eternal life;" بقا تراست و بس "To thee belongs eternal duration, and this is enough; or there it ends;" that is to say, "Eternal duration is not the attribute

bute of any other BEING;") &c. Of the occurrence of the word بس, after از, the following example may be adduced: ازبسکه بزندان غمت دیر بماندیم " So long have I lingered in the prison of my love for you;" زنجیر به تنگ آمد و زندان گله دارد " That my very chains have become weary, and my prison itself has begun to wail." The words بسی and بسا are of common occurrence in the Language, in the sense of MANY; and from the word بس. is derived the adjective , بسند SUFFICIENT.

بل NAY.

THIS word, borrowed from the Arabs, is of common occurrence in the Persian Language; being generally followed by the particle که, (بلکه,) though that particle is sometimes omitted. It occurs properly between two propositions, both of which are fully expressed: as یار من ماه است بلکه خورشید است " My mistress is a Moon, nay, she is a Sun." It is employed to indicate the relation signified by the term اضراب TURNING AWAY; so called, because the speaker generally turns from the first proposition, in order to fix the attention of his hearer on the second by which it may happen to be followed.

Now the word بل has no real fluctuations of sense, and will therefore be found to indicate the relation signified by the term اضراب in every example that can be adduced. But if we enquire into the possible *motives* of a man who turns away from one proposition in order to fix our attention on another, it will certainly appear that these are various; and the reader, I suppose, need not be told that the practical application of the word بل to the purposes of Speech, cannot be better illustrated than by a detail of the motives, exis-

ting

ting in the mind of the speaker, which may give occasion to such application. This is the object of the following rules, which are few in number, and, as I hope, sufficiently comprehensive to effect the purpose of their insertion here.

RULE FIRST.

THE word بلکه is occasionally found to indicate the relation signified by the term إبطال; and this happens when the speaker intends, by the second proposition, to correct an error either committed or pointed out in the first. Examples: زید سخی است بلکه بخیل است "ZYDE is liberal, no, not liberal, but a miser." Here the error is committed by the speaker, and immediately pointed out as a mere LAPSUS LINGUÆ, such as may sometimes occur in oral communication, but hardly ever in written composition. این مژده مرا نیست بلکه دشمنم را است "These tidings have no joy for me, but will be grateful to my enemies." The error of conception here rests, or is presumed to rest, with the party addressed; and the speaker, having pointed it out in the first proposition which is therefore *negative, proceeds* afterwards to correct it in the second, *which is generally affirmative* on that account.

RULE SECOND.

THE word بلکه is sometimes found to indicate the relation signified by the term ترقی ASCENSION; in which case, the second proposition will be employed to form a CLIMAX to the first. Example: گروهیش خوانند صاحب سریر "Some people call him the Lord of a throne; ولایت ستان بلکه آفاق گیر "A conqueror of Kingdoms, nay, a prince subjecting the whole world to his dominion." Here, the first proposition is held to be defective in force of expression, and the speaker

therefore

therefore turns to another, which not only confirms, but augments and extends the ideas comprifed in the firft.

RULE THIRD.

The word بلکه is fometimes found to indicate the relation fignified by the term تنزّل Sinking; which conveys an idea the very oppofite of that fignified by the word ترقّی. Examples: دور از بتان مباد مرا دیده بلکه بار " Never be my eyes deprived of the fight of the beloved of my foul!" مردم ز دیده و دیده ز سر سر ز تن جدا " Nay fooner let the ball quit the eye, and the eye quit the head, and the head be fevered from the body of her lover." Here, the climax of mifery is obvioufly comprifed in the firft propofition, from which the devoted lover turns away, for the purpofe of propofing a *milder* alternative; which is the meaning implied in the term تنزّل or Sinking, as oppofed to the term ترقّی Ascension.

RULE FOURTH.

The word بلکه is fometimes found to indicate fimply the relation fignified by the term انتقال or Change; in which cafe, it has the force merely of a Copulative Conjunction. Example: زید آمد بلکه عمر آمد " Zyde came, nay Amr too came;" provided the fpeaker means merely to affert that " both come;" without any reference to the relations fignified by the terms انتقال, ترقّی, and تنزّل, as juft now explained.

RULE FIFTH.

In the Perfian Lauguage, but never I believe in the Arabic Tongue, the word بلکه is fometimes employed in a fenfe nearly approaching to that of شاید Perhaps; though even

in that case, I am disposed to believe that its application might be traced to the relation signified by the term اضراب. Example: گر بلطف اِ نظری می کنی امروز بکن "If you condescend to look on TOGHRA, let it be to day;" بلکه از درد فراق تو بفردا نرسد "For, overwhelmed by the pain of his absence from you, it is probable that he will not be alive to-morrow!" &c.

CONCLUSION.

THE Arabian Grammarians have observed that the word بلکه is sometimes followed by a مفرد; the term مفرد being opposed to the term جمله A SENTENCE, in the manner stated in a note to PAGE 57 OF THIS VOLUME. In this case, the sentence may be AFFIRMATIVE: as زید آمد بلکه عمرو "ZYDE came, nay AMR;" or IMPERATIVE: as زید را بزن بلکه عمرو را "Beat ZYDE, nay AMR;" or NEGATIVE: as زید نیامد بلکه عمرو "ZYDE did not come, nay AMR;" or PROHIBITIVE: as زید را مزن بلکه عمرو را "Do not beat ZYDE, nay AMR;" &c. And in the case of an *affirmative* or *imperative* sentence, the Arabian Grammarians have determined unanimously that "ZYDE is to be considered as مسکوت عنه;" that is to say, "as if his name had not been mentioned in the sentence at all." The phrase زید آمد بلکه عمرو means therefore that "AMR came;" but whether ZYDE came or not, is a point on which we have no information. And so, also, the phrase زید را بزن بلکه عمرو را means merely "Beat AMR;" but whether ZYDE is to be beaten or not, is a point on which we have no information.

BUT if we substitute the negative: زید نیامد بلکه عمرو "ZYDE did not come, nay AMR;" or the *prohibitive*: زید را مزن بلکه عمرو را "Do not beat ZYDE, nay AMR;" the

question

queſtion is not equally clear according to the opinion of the Arabian Grammarians, who differ materially from each other in the deciſions which they have adopted on the ſubject of it. The majority maintain that Zyde is not here to be conſidered as مَسْكُوتٌ عَنْهُ; in which caſe, the propoſition is effective with regard to him, (Zyde,) of whom it is affirmed that "He did not come," and that "We are not at liberty to beat him." Others maintain that Zyde is here alſo مَسْكُوتٌ عَنْهُ; in which caſe, the propoſition is non-effective with regard to him; that is to ſay, we cannot tell whether he came or not, nor have we any orders either to beat him, or let him alone. And the ſame obſcurity here envelopes the fate of Amr, ſince the Arabian Grammarians have left it doubtful whether the negative compriſed in the firſt member of the ſentence (زَيْد نَيَامَد or زَيْد رَا مَزَن) is to be affirmed or deſtroyed in the ſecond, though the latter is held to be the better opinion. If the negative be affirmed (or continued) in the ſecond member of the ſentence, the meaning of the words بَلْكِه عَمْرو will then be نَيَامَد "Nay Amr did not come;" and, on the contrary, if the negative ſhall be deſtroyed, we muſt then ſupply بَلْكِه عَمْرو آمَد "But Amr came."

It follows from theſe obſervations, that the phraſe زَيْد نَيَامَد بَلْكِه عَمْرو is eſſentially obſcure in all its parts; becauſe it may ſignify, *firſt*, that Zyde did not come; *ſecondly*, that we have no information with regard to the coming or not coming of Zyde; *thirdly*, that Amr came; and *finally*, that Amr did not come. And this obſcurity, which warrants the condemnation of all ſuch phraſes, may, I conceive, be eaſily traced to the nature of the relation ſignified by the term اِضْرَاب, which the word بَل is formed to denote.

With regard to the phraſe زَيْد آمَد نَه بَلْكِه عَمْرو "Zyde came,

came, no, but Amr," it will generally mean that "Zyde did not come, but Amr came;" and so, also, the phrase زید نیامد نه بلکه عمرو "Zyde did not come, no, but Amr," seems to me to have the same sense: "Zyde did not come, no, but Amr came;" because the second negative is here employed, not to destroy, but merely to corroborate the sense of the first. It is obvious, however, that these phrases are essentially obscure, and therefore unfit for general use. I now proceed to consider the nature and application of the word بلی Yes, to the purposes of speech.

بلی Yes.

This word, borrowed from the Arabs, and by them written and pronounced بَلَیٰ, is of common occurrence in the Persian Language; being employed in the sense of آری Yes, with which it is synonimous in every respect. The reader will therefore revert to *Page 428 et seq. of this Volume*; *and substituting, in every example, the word* بلی *for the word* آری, will thence infer the proper *application of either to* every purpose of Persian composition.

In the Arabic Language, the practical application of the word بَلَیٰ Yes, is much more limited than it is found to be in the Persian tongue: for it cannot be uttered as an answer to any affirmative proposition whatever; being directly opposed, in point of sense, to the word لا No, which is the answer, in the negative, to a proposition expressed in the affirmative form. And as the word لا destroys the affirmative, so the word بَلَیٰ destroys the negative; both being opposed, in point of sense, to the word نَعَمْ, Yes or No, which is employed indifferently to affirm the positive or negative form of every proposition to which it may happen to be uttered as an answer.

To

To explain by examples. The phrase "ZYDE came," or "Did ZYDE come?" cannot be answered by the word بَلَى, because it is expressed in the affirmative form. But it may be answered by the words نَعَم YES or لَا NO, by the former of which, the hearer is given to understand that "ZYDE came;" and by the latter, that "ZYDE did not come." And the phrase "ZYDE did not come," or "Did not ZYDE come?" cannot be answered by the word لَا No, because that word never answers any proposition which is not expressed in the positive form. But it may be accurately answered by the word نَعَم "No; ZYDE did not come;" or by the word بَلَى "YES; ZYDE came;" whence it is obvious, *first*, that بَلَى is properly employed to convert the negative into the positive form; *secondly*, that لَا is properly employed to convert the positive into the negative form; and *finally*, that نَعَم is properly employed to establish the form, whether positive or negative, in which a given proposition may have been first uttered. It follows that the phrase أَلَسْتُ بِرَبِّكُم "Am not I your GOD?" supposed to have been addressed by the DEITY to his creatures, was properly answered by the word بَلَى YES; and that نَعَم, employed instead of بَلَى, would have been there equivalent to a denial of the truth. *

يَتْر NEVER; ALSO.

I HAVE nothing to observe of this word, except that it occurs occasionally in either of the senses here im-

* Sir WILLIAM JONES has mistaken the sense of the phrase mentioned in the text, which he somewhere translates, "Are not you with your GOD?" misled by the introduction of the preposition بِ, which is here a mere pleonasm. That he mistook أَلَسْتُ in the first person, for أَلَسْتَ in the second, was perhaps a natural consequence of the first error.

puted

puted to it. Examples: دُرِ مدح ناکسان ناسفتم که زمن نپرهیزد "I shall never disgrace myself by the praise of the unworthy:" نه این را ازان آزرده ورزی نپرهیزد "Neither, also, did the one ever occasion vexation to the other;" &c.

بی Without.

This is another, and the most common form of the word آ, already noticed in Page 426 of this Volume. It indicates the relation of privation, known in Grammar by the term سلب; and is *indifferently* applicable to nouns of every species: as زید بی بکر آمد "Zyde came without Bukr;" زید بی صبر است "Zyde has no patience;" بی دلبران عشرتی نباید خواست "Seek no pleasure without your beloved;" &c. Like most of the prepositions, it may form a component part of a compound epithet: as مرد بی زر "A moneyless man;" خانهٔ بی در "A house without a door;" جام بی باده "A cup without wine;" مرد بی صبر "An impatient man;" تخت بی تاجور "A throne without a king;" صحبت بی یار "Society in the absence of a beloved object;" عاشق بی دلدار "A lover who is deprived of the presence of his beloved;" &c. And in this case, it is necessary that the second component part of the epithet shall not be capable of forming an attributive applicable to the substantive noun expressed in the sentence, without the intervention of some preposition. Accordingly, the attributive تاجور "A prince," cannot be applied to the substantive تخت "A throne," without the intervention of some preposition; nor can the adjective دلدار "A beloved object," without the intervention of some preposition, be here applied to عاشق "The lover;" because the phrase دلدار means دارندهٔ دل عاشق

"The

" The keeper of the heart of the lover," an epithet which obviouſly belongs to his miſtreſs, and cannot be accurately aſſumed by him. In the abſence of this condition, the negative نا will neceſſarily ſupercede the prepoſition بی : as مرد نا عاقل " A fooliſh man;" مرد ناخردمند " An unwiſe man ;" &c. And the difference of ſenſe between نا and بی will be obvious to thoſe who conſider that the former implies mere NEGATION, whereas the latter implies PRIVATION.

پس AFTER; THEN; &c.

THIS word is unqueſtionably a noun of the claſs termed ظروف; being oppoſed, in point of ſenſe, to the word پیش BEFORE, which has never been aſſigned to the claſs of particles by any Grammarian. Yet the word پس, being very commonly employed to tranſlate the Arabic particle ف, has been therefore ſuppoſed to perform the functions of a PARTICLE, as well as of a NOUN; and though I will not undertake to affirm the accuracy of this opinion, or to maintain that the word پس has in reality the character of a particle on any occaſion, I think myſelf bound neverthe-leſs, to detail, in the form of general rules, the facts that relate to its practical uſe, in order that the reader may judge for himſelf.

RULE FIRST.

THE word پس is occaſionally employed to denote the relation of ARRANGEMENT, known in Grammar by the term ترتیب. Examples: زید آمد پس بکر " ZYDE came firſt, and then BUKR;" زید آمد پس بکر رفت " ZYDE came, and then BUKR went away;" &c. In this caſe, the word پس indicates merely the order of arrangement, and the accident of DELAY is commonly ſignified by the word پس تر SOME TIME AFTER.

RULE

RULE SECOND.

There is a ſpecies of ARRANGEMENT known in Grammar by the term تَرْتِیبِ ذِکْرِی, which is often ſignified by the word پَس. In this caſe, the word پَس occurs after a general propoſition, which is to be detailed or rendered ſpecific by two or more following propoſitions. Example:

چُو صُبْح دَمِید بِه تَهِیَّهٔ نَمَاز پَرْدَاخْتَم "When the morning broke, I prepared for prayer;" پَس وُضُو کَرْدَم و دَر مَسْجِد رَفْتَم "Accordingly, I performed my ablutions and *went to the moſque*;" و بِه قِیَام و قُعُود و رُکُوع و سُجُود پَرْدَاخْتَم "And put in practice (the preſcribed ceremonies, namely,) ſtanding, ſitting, bending the body, and proſtration;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

The word پَس is often employed to denote the relation of SEQUENCE, known in Grammar by the term تَعْقِیب; and in this caſe, it is a matter of no importance whether the SEQUENCE ſhall be remote or immediate, *neceſſary* or contingent; &c. Examples: گُوی را بِچُوگَان زَدَم پَس مُتَحَرِّک شُد "I ſtruck the ball with a club, and it moved;"

زَیْد نِکَاح کَرْد پَس اُو را فَرْزَنْدِی بِوُجُود آمَد "ZYDE married, and had a child by his wife;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It is employed to denote the relation ſignified by the term تَفْرِیع; in which caſe, it will govern a given propoſition comprifing the deduction which is drawn from certain preliminary obſervations or facts. Example from MOLOVEE ROOM: اَز جَمَادِی مُرْدَم و نَامِی شُدَم "I ceaſed to be

be (insensible as a clod or) a stone; and attained the rank of vegetative life;" وز نما مردم ز حیوان دم زدم "I again changed my state, and became an animal;" مردم از حیوانی و آدم شدم "Ceasing to be an animal, I then became a man;" پس چه ترسم کی ز مردن کم شدم "What then have I to fear? and when has death been the cause of degradation to me?" Or more literally, "I died as a stone, and became a vegetable; I died as a vegetable, and became an animal;" &c. The Molovee alludes, in all probability, to the circumstances that precede and follow the organization of life. The elementary materials of the future man, at first insensible like a clod or a stone, become vegetative at the period of conception; gestation follows, and ripens these into an animal endued with sensation and life. Thought and reason bring up the rear, and mark the maturity of intellectual growth. Whence it follows, that every change having hitherto proved advantageous to him, he has no cause to fear DEATH, which is not the precursor of annihilation, or even the signal of descending gradation, but merely a change of STATE or BEING, precisely similar to those sustained on so many former occasions, and therefore a blessing, because it marks his entrance into a HIGHER state of intellectual existence. He goes on, accordingly, to predict his advancement to the rank of an Angel, and subsequent progress in the scale of BEING, up to the very DEITY himself, from whose ESSENCE his spirit originally emanated, and with whom it is ultimately destined to unite, in a union so inconceivably perfect as utterly to annihilate the idea of distinction between the CREATURE and the CREATOR; in which consists the SUMMUM BONUM of these visionary, but sublime devotees.

بار دیگر بمیرم از بشر "If I am doomed as a man to die once more;" با ملایک تا برارم بال و پر "Even so shall I rise to

 the

the rank of an Angel ; "وز ملک هم بایدم قربان شدن" "And thence will approach still nearer to God ;" "آنچه اندر وهم ناید آن شدن" "And become at length what I cannot describe!"

RULE FIFTH.

The word پس may be accurately prefixed to the second member of a conditional sentence proper and improper ; or to the second member of a sentence formed by means of a relative pronoun. Examples : "اگر کار کنی پس مزد یابی" "If you work, you shall obtain the reward of your labor ;" "زید که پدر تست پس از عقوقش بترس" "Zyde being your father, you should therefore beware of disobeying him ;" &c. Or the relation signified by the term سببیت ; in which case, it comes between two propositions connected by the relation of cause and effect. Example: "زید را اندرز دادم پس ناخوش شد" "I admonished Zyde; and therefore he became angry ;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

I have nothing farther to observe on the nature of the word پس , which seems to me to have the same sense in every example that can be adduced. In translations from the Arabic into the Persian Tongue, the word پس is often inserted with some violation to the idiom of the latter, merely because that of the former requires the use of the particle ف , which cannot be translated by any other word. It is the duty of every translator to represent faithfully the sense of his author ; but the servile habit of introducing into one Language words required merely by the idiom of another, and no way necessary to the sense of a passage, must be considered as highly reprehensible, since it tends only to the debasement of Speech.

تا To; Since; Until; &c.

The word تا is directly opposed, in point of sense, to the word از From; and therefore indicates the End of a space, (انتهای غایت) being indifferently applicable to time; place; number; and quantity; as the following examples will sufficiently evince. از بام تا شام رفتم "I walked from morn to even;" از هند تا سند گشتم "I travelled from Hind even to Sind;" بتدریج از یک تا هزار کس جمع شدند "The number gradually encreased from one to a thousand men;" بنگریستمش از سر تا پا دیدم "I looked at him attentively from head to foot;" &c. The idea of space or distance, may be also applied by metaphor to certain events consider-ed with reference to each other: as for Example: از شنیدن تا دیدن فاصله بسیار است "There is a great difference between hearing and seeing;" (between hear-say and sight;) و از گفتن تا کردن مرحله بی شمار "And it is one thing to talk, and another thing to act;" &c. I proceed to detail the rules applicable to the practical ap-plication of the word تا to the purposes of Speech; having first premised that though I believe that word has no real fluctuations of sense, I will not undertake to affirm the fact, but leave the question to be determined by the judgment of the reader, after the examples to be considered shall be fully before him.

RULE FIRST.

If the word تا shall occur between two nouns of the same class, (that is to say, if the sense of the second shall be includ-ed in that of the first, as the limbs are included in the gene-ral sense of the term body,) then the sense of the verb which is transitive to the first noun, will be generally transitive to the

second

second also. Example: ماهی را تا سرش خوردم " I eat the fish even to the head; or including the head;" همه کس تا زید حاضر آمدند " All these people came, even to ZYDE; or including ZYDE;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

If the two nouns shall not be of the same class, the sense of the verb applicable to the first noun, will not be generally transitive to the second. Example: تمام روز تا شب رفتم " I walked all day until night;" (at which time, I ceased to walk;) &c. It is probable that there are some exceptions to each of these rules.

RULE THIRD.

The noun following the particle تا is generally the last of those to which the *action of the* verb is transitive: as for Example: قرآن را تا سورهٔ ناس خواندم " I read the KOORAUN, (or its chapters,) even, to, or including the SOORA É NAUS," which is the last Chapter in the Book. *But if the nouns to which the verb is transitive shall differ in their nature from each other, the last noun will* then be determined by adverting merely to the probabilities of the case. Example: همه انسان تا پیغمبران هلاک اند " All men die, even to the prophets;" همه فوج تا پیاده رسیدند " The whole army arrived, even to, or including the foot soldiers;" &c. DEATH is less likely to happen to the prophets than to other men; and the arrival of soldiers travelling on foot, is likely to *follow* the arrival of those who travel by any quicker conveyance; whence it happens that both here follow the word تا, because the arrangement is determined, not by a reference to the order of time, (since the foot may have arrived before the horse,) but simply by adverting to the probabilities of the case.

RULE

RULE FOURTH.

The word تا is found occaſionally to denote the relation of Association; known in Grammar by the term معیّت, and commonly expreſſed by the word با, or the copulative conjunction واو عاطفه. Example: مُردان تا کودکان بهم آمدند "The men and the children aſſembled together." But the example might be thus tranſlated: "The men, even to the children, aſſembled together;" whence it follows that the word تا does not here ſuffer any real fluctuation of ſenſe.

RULE FIFTH.

The word تا is found occaſionally to denote the relation of Explanation, known in Grammar by the term تبیین. Example: زید را گفتم تا هنر آموزد "I told *Zyde* that he ſhould acquire excellence;" &c. Or the relation of Causation, known in Grammar by the term تعلیل: in which caſe, it indicates the end or purpose (غایت و غرض) for which a given action is to be, or may have been performed. Example: درخت نشاندم تا بر خورم "I have planted trees that I may eat the fruit;" &c. But in the event of the narration, by the ſpeaker, of a Command which has been obeyed, the verb following the particle تا will generally aſſume the form of the paſt tenſe. Example: فرّاش باد صبا را گفته تا فرش زمرّدین بگسترد "He (the Deity) iſſued his commands to the morning breeze, which ſpread, accordingly, the verdant carpet of the earth;" &c. The ſubſtitution of the aoriſt گسترد, would no doubt be accurate here: "He iſſued his commands to the morning breeze to ſpread, or (more literally) that it ſhould ſpread the verdant carpet of the earth;" but then it would remain doubtful (if, for the deity, we ſubſtitute the name of an earthly ruler,) whether the command was obeyed or not.

not. This doubt is very briefly removed by ſubſtituting for the aoriſt the paſt tenſe of the verb, which is therefore elegant in all the examples of this claſs.

RULE SIXTH.

It indicates occaſionally the BEGINNING OF A SPACE OF TIME; or more properly, in my opinion, the WHOLE ſpace of time compriſed in the propoſition by which it is followed. Examples: تا کرده ام نظاره لب پر آب تو نگار، "Ever ſince I have ſeen your lips full of moiſture;" تا کرده ام بنرگس پر خواب تو نظر "Ever ſince I have looked on your languiſhing eyes;" گاهی چو لاله ام ز وصالت شگفته رو "Sometimes I bloſſom in your preſence like a tulip;" گاهی چو نرگسم ز فراقت شکسته سر "And ſometimes I droop in your abſence like the NURGIS." If the two propoſitions by which the particle تا is followed in all the examples of this claſs, ſhall happen to be connected by the relation of CAUSE AND EFFECT, the word تا is then termed تای شرطیّه or THE CONDITIONAL تا, becauſe *its place may be ſupplied by the word* چون: or otherwiſe it is commonly termed تای ابتدائیّه, or "*The* تا *which indicates* the beginning of a ſpace of time." Examples: تا زید را دیده ام حرکتی از وی نه پسندیده ام "Ever ſince I have ſeen (or known) ZYDE, I have ſeen nothing in his conduct which I can approve." (This is the تای ابتدائیّه) تا خیالت در دل آمد چشم بر بستم ز خلق "Ever ſince your idea has been the inmate of my boſom, I have ſhut my eyes againſt all mankind." (This is the تای شرطیّه, but there is not, in my opinion, any eſſential diſtinction between them.)

RULE SEVENTH.

It is found to indicate occaſionally the relation ſignified by the term توقیت, an infinitive derived from وقت, TIME.

In

In this case, it corresponds with the English word WHILE; being employed to limit the duration of one proposition, by the means of another with which it is connected. Example: که تا بر فلک ماه و خورشید است " For while the SUN and the MOON keep their places in the heavens;" درین دفترت ذکر جاوید است " Your name shall be preserved in this volume." It is obvious that one of these propositions is here employed " to measure the period of the duration of the other;" and as the one is eternal, so the other is declared to be so too. And if we substitute the phrase تو بنشین تا زید نشیند " Do you sit, WHILE ZYDE sits," both propositions will then be temporary; but still the duration of one will serve as a limit to that of the other. This (and every similar) example admits however of another sense: " Do you sit UNTIL ZYDE sits; or shall sit;" (" and when he sits do you get up;") and the context alone can determine which of these two senses may happen to be intended on a given occasion. If we substitute for نشیند the compounded form تو بنشین تا زید نشسته ماند (ور نشسته ماند) " Do you sit while ZYDE continues to sit;") the obscurity will necessarily cease, and the word تا must then be translated by the word WHILE. The two propositions are distinguished from each other by the terms موقت or " Limited in duration;" and موقت به " Limitary;" or " That by which the other is limited."

RULE EIGHTH.

THE word تا is often employed, before an Interrogative, to indicate the relation of DOUBTFUL EXPECTATION; known in Grammar by the terms ترقب و انتظار. In this case, it is supposed to be nearly equivalent to the words باید دید " Let us see;" or " Let it be seen;" though it might be accurately

translated,

tranſlated, in my opinion, by the word THEN. Example: تا چه خواهد کرد با من دور گیتی از دو کار "Let us ſee then which of theſe two events fortune is diſpoſed to accompliſh in my caſe;" دست او در گردنم یا خون من در گردنش "Shall her arms encircle my neck, or ſhall my blood be on her head!" &c.

RULE NINTH.

It has been ſuppoſed to indicate *occaſionally* the ſenſe of the word هرگز NEVER: as for Example: تا نپنداری که احوال جهانداران خوش است "Never imagine that the condition of worldly men is happy." Or to convey ſome idea of REPROACH and CENSURE; as for Example: ای هنرها نهاده بر کف دست "O! you who oſtentatiouſly expoſe your virtues in the palms of your hands;" عیبها بر گرفته زیر بغل "And hide your vices under your arms;" تا چه خواهی خریدن ای مغرور "For ſhame! what do you expect to purchaſe, O proud man!" روز درماندگی بسیم دغل "On the day of judgment, with money that is *baſe!*" that is to ſay, "What will it then avail you to boaſt of the appearance of virtues, which, in reality, you do not poſſeſs." In either of theſe examples, the particle تا might be accurately tranſlated, in my opinion, by the word THEN.

RULE TENTH.

The particle که may be optionally inſerted after تا employed to denote the relations ſignified by the terms تعلیل ; ابتدا ; شرط ; and توقیت ; as already explained in the preceeding rules. Examples: نیکی کن تا که بدی گردت نیاید "Practiſe virtue, that ſo no evil may befal you;" تا که زید را دیده ام از وی خورسند بوده ام "I have been pleaſed

ed with Zyde, ever ſince I ſaw him;" تا که یار را دیدم "Ever ſince I have ſeen my beloved;" روی غم ندیدم "I have never ſeen the face of grief;" نیک نام باش "Continue to preſerve a good name;" تا که جهان پایدار باشد "While the world endures." But the word که is not unfrequently found to take precedence of تا. Example: از بدی گریزان باش که تا نیک نام شوی "Avoid evil, that ſo you may obtain a good name;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

I have little more to obſerve on the nature and application of the word تا, which is very commonly added to numerals, for the purpoſe of forming a ſpecies of the relative noun: as یکتا Unique; دوتا Double; سه تا Triple; &c. &c. Here, however, it is perhaps a noun, having the ſenſe of فرد Single, as oppoſed to جفت A match. It is otherwiſe employed in various ſenſes for which the reader is referred to the Dictionary.

تاش

This is a termination, employed to indicate "the participation of two or more objects in the ſenſe of the noun to which it is annexed:" as خواجه تاش "A fellow ſervant;" or literally, "Either of two or more individuals who participate in the ſervice of the ſame maſter;" خیل تاش "Either of two or more members of the ſame tribe;" &c. Example: من و تو هر دو خواجه تاشانیم "You and I are fellow ſervants of the ſame maſter;" &c.

جز Other; Except; &c.

This word properly ſignifies other, and has no real fluctuations of ſenſe. It is nearly ſynonimous with the Arabic غیر,

 but

but cannot, like that word, be employed in the ſenſe of a negative, before a given adjective noun: as زید غیر عاقل است "Zyde is unwiſe;" &c. It is neceſſarily followed by the مضاف الیه, but without the intervention of the vowel *Kuſra:* as جز خدا هیچ است "All but God is nothing;" &c. Yet the place of that vowel point is ſometimes ſupplied by the prepoſition از: as جز از تو ندانم درین عهد کس "I know no man.(that is to ſay, no good or generous man,) in this age, but only you;" &c. Being a noun, not a particle, it may, like other nouns, form the ſubject or the predicate of a given propoſition; the agent or object of a given verb; &c. as که جز یاد او نامدش بر زبان "He never ſpoke of any thing but her;" or more literally, "Other than the remembrance of her never paſſed his lips."

Of its occurrence in the ſenſe of مگر, the following example may be adduced: داری بحال زار غریبان ترحمی "You have compaſſion on the ſtate of all the wretched;" جز آصفی که بهر تو شد از وطن جدا "Except Ausŭfee, who has been ſeparated from his home on your account." It is to be obſerved, however, that the word مگر *never precedes the* مستثنی منه; a fact which is not true of the word جز, which may precede the مستثنی منه: as جز زید همه رسیدند "They are all arrived but Zyde;" &c. The particle به, prefixed as a mere pleonaſm to the word جز, is of common occurrence in the Language: as بجز تو نیست دلداری "I have no miſtreſs but only you;" &c.

SECTION FOURTH.

چون How? When; Since; As; Like; &c.

As an interrogative pronoun, in the ſenſe of how? *the* word چون has already been conſidered in page 118 of this volume,

VOLUME, to which the reader is therefore referred. As a ظَرفِ زَمان or NOUN OF TIME, it muſt be generally tranſlated by the word WHEN: and as a كلمهٔ تَشبِيه or WORD OF SIMILITUDE, it has generally the ſenſe of the word LIKE. Theſe are two diſtinct characters of the word چُون, each of which are now to be conſidered in their order.

چُون WHEN.

THIS word cannot be accurately employed as an interrogative pronoun; ("When did you ſee this man?" &c.) and muſt therefore be invariably followed by TWO PROPOSITIONS, as in the phraſe چُون زَيد آمد بكر رَفت "When ZYDE arrived, BUKR departed," and other examples of the ſame nature. It indicates "the coincidence, in point of time, of the occurrence of two given events compriſed in either member of the ſentence by which it is followed:" whence it follows, with reference to the preceding example, that "The arrival of ZYDE, and the departure of BUKR, happened nearly at the ſame period of time." And as we have here no information with regard to the CAUSE of the departure of BUKR, which may or may not be owing to the arrival of ZYDE, ſo it follows that the two members of a ſentence following the word چُون WHEN, are not neceſſarily connected by the relation of CAUSE AND EFFECT. But though not neceſſarily, they are very commonly connected by that relation: as it happens in the phraſe چُون يارم بَرسَد كارم آسان گَردَد "When my BELOVED arrives, I ſhall then be eaſy;" for though the word چُون indicates merely the coincidence, in point of time, of the occurrence of the two events compriſed in either member of this propoſition, it is quite plain that the ſpeaker is enabled to predict that coincidence, merely by the conviction, exiſting in his mind, that the events in queſtion are connected by the relation of CAUSE AND EFFECT. The ſentence, therefore,

fore, is obviously conditional: "When my BELOVED arrives, I shall then be easy, because her arrival will necessarily produce the effect of making me easy;" and the word چون, by which it is governed, is accordingly termed شرطیه or CONDITIONAL; not because that word has *itself* acquired a CONDITIONAL character, but merely because it governs the two members of a sentence connected by the relation of CAUSE AND EFFECT. I now proceed to detail the rules applicable to the practical application of the word چون WHEN, followed by the two members of a conditional sentence: having first premised that there is nothing to be observed* on the practical application of that word, followed by the two members of a sentence which is not conditional; that is to say, connected by the relation of CAUSE AND EFFECT.

RULE FIRST.

THE past tenses of the verb *must* be employed, as it might be expected, to indicate past time in both members, or in either member of a CONDITIONAL SENTENCE following the word چون WHEN. Examples: دلا چو پیر شدی ترک نوجوانی کن "O my heart, now that your are old, leave off, I pray you, the follies of youth;" چون آن جا رسیدم با زید دوچار شدم "When I arrived there, I met with ZYDE;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

THE Aorist, or the Future tense of the verb *may* be accurately employed, as it might be expected, to indicate future time in both members, or in either member of a CONDITIONAL SENTENCE following the word چون WHEN. Example: ببیند چو باغبان گل روی تو یک نظر "When the gardener shall once behold the rose of your face," دیگر بعمر تو ندهد آب لاله را "He will never more take the pains to water the tulip." (So inferior is the color of *that* flower, to the blooming lustre of your fine complexion.)

RULE THIRD.

But the past tenſe of the verb may be alſo employed, and is in fact more frequently employed than the Aoriſt or Future tenſe, to indicate future time in both members, or in either member of a conditional sentence following the word چون When. Example: شراب خورده و خوی کرده چون شدی بچمن "When you walk into the garden, your face bedewed, and fluſhed with wine;" فروغ روی تو آتش در ارغوان انداخت "The luſtre of your complexion adds, or will add, new vermillion even to the tints of the Arghawaun." It follows plainly, from the employment of the paſt tenſe of the verb to denote, indifferently, paſt or future time, that the preceding example might be otherwiſe tranſlated: "When you went into the garden, your face bedewed, and fluſhed with wine, the luſtre of your complexion added new vermillion even to the tints of the Arghawaun." How then is the obſcurity to be removed, which is obviouſly inherent in all the examples of this nature? I anſwer that it cannot be removed otherwiſe than by adverting to the context, which will certainly determine the queſtion in every neceſſary caſe. And if the queſtion cannot be determined by the context, as it very often happens in Perſian poetry, the reader will then be at liberty to give the preference to paſt or future time, according to the dictates of his own fancy or judgment.

CONCLUSION.

I have little more to obſerve on the nature and application of the word چون When; which may be accurately followed by all the tenſes of a Perſian verb, being variouſly tranſlated by the words When; Whenever; Since; or As; &c. according to the examples in which it may happen to occur. When followed by the Aoriſt or Future tenſe, it is very often convertible with اگر If: as in the phraſe

 بپسند

ببیند چو باغبان گل روی تو یک نظر "When the gardener shall once behold the rose of your face;" where اگر might supply the place of چون, without producing any very material change in the sense of the passage. But if we examine attentively the proper acceptation of either term, it will certainly appear that the word اگر IF, is usually employed in cases of DOUBT; whereas the word چون WHEN, is commonly employed in cases of CERTAINTY. We say "IF the two armies shall come to a battle," when that event is matter of doubt; and generally convert the IF into WHEN; "WHEN the two armies shall come to a battle," *in the case of an expectation,* previously *formed, that* a battle between them is about to take place. And as the Persians are very commonly in the habit of expressing, by the past tense of the verb, those future events which they believe to be of certain occurrence; so, a given proposition having a real reference to future time, will yet be very commonly expressed by the past tense of the verb, whenever it happens to follow the word چون WHEN, which is naturally applicable to cases of CERTAINTY. It remains only to remark that the word چون WHEN, is sometimes understood where *it is not* expressed: as طالع چه کند بر من از آنت نظری نیست "Since you have no disposition to favor me, what can FORTUNE effect in my favor? &c. I now proceed to consider the nature and application of the word چون LIKE; which is a کلمهٔ تشبیه or WORD OF SIMILITUDE.

چون LIKE.

THE terms of a SIMILE fully expressed, comprise, *first*, the مشبه or "Thing compared;" *secondly*, the مشبه به or "Object with which it is compared;" *thirdly*, the ادات التشبیه or "Instrument of comparison;" as چون or مانند LIKE; and *finally*, the وجه التشبیه or "Point of comparison;" as

COURAGE;

COURAGE; &c. which muſt be common to both nouns, and more eſpecially remarkable in the مشبه به. Example: زید در شجاعت چون شیر است "ZYDE, in point of courage, reſembles a Lion;" &c. The وجه التشبیه or POINT OF COMPARISON, is not, however, invariably expreſſed in terms; and will be commonly and elegantly omitted in the caſe of ſimile of ſuch a nature as to enable the reader to ſupply the omiſſion. Example: دو پاکیزه پیکر چو حور و پری "Two fine youths, GRACEFUL as the Howras of paradiſe; with FORMS delicate as that of the Fairies;" چو خورشید و چون زهره و مشتری "In SPLENDOR equal to the SUN; having VOICES ſoft and tuneful as that of VENUS; and of an UNDERSTANDING which rivals the wiſdom of JUPITER;" &c. The ادات التشبیه or INSTRUMENT OF COMPARISON, as چون; مانند; &c. is often omitted on the ſame principle.

EXAMPLE FROM FERDOUSEE.

به تن ژنده پیل و بجان جبرئیل   بکف ابر بهمن بدل رود نیل

"HIS body ſtrong as a raging elephant; his mind pure as the Angel GABRIEL; his hand bountiful as the raining clouds; his heart liberal as the flowing NILE."

AND the Perſian Poets, proceeding yet a ſtep farther, are very fond of rejecting every part of the ſimile, except only the مشبه به, which then ſupplies the place of the مشبه; creating a ſource of endleſs difficulty to the European readers of Perſian Poetry, who are not eaſily brought to comprehend the multiplicity of remote or unknown metaphors often crammed into the compaſs of a ſingle line. Example: طرف سمن چو برشکست سنبل حلقه زای را "When ſhe hung the circling hyacinth around the lily," ("When ſhe overſpread her face, fair as the lily, with her curling locks, waving as the hyacinth,"

hyacinth,") کشتگی هزار شد نرگس سرمه سای را "The execution of her bright and piercing eyes resembling the Nurgis, was encreased in the proportion of a thousand fold*."

It would require the space of a large Dictionary to illustrate in detail the ordinary application of Persian metaphors, familiar to the natives of that country, though often unintelligible to the English reader, because they are wholly unknown to the English Tongue. I shall therefore only remark, on this subject, that many of those metaphors are highly beautiful in my estimation, and that the imputed absurdity of *many* others, has no existence but in the imagination of those who do not understand them. It is a common fault of the English readers of Persian Poetry, to mistake or extend beyond its proper limits the وجه الشبه, or Point of Comparison; yet no simile can be reasonably condemned or applauded until the point of comparison shall be first ascertained. Thus it happens, that when a Persian Poet compares the face of his mistress to the full moon, the figure is apt to present an idea highly disagreeable to the mind of many an English reader, who pictures to himself a woman with a face large and round as a mathematical circle; utterly destitute of true *symmetry*, and swelled and bloated in such a manner, as can result only from the grossest intemperance. Now what is the idea conveyed by the same metaphor to the mind of the Persian Poet who employs it, or to that of his reader who is really conversant in the idiom and genius of the Persian Tongue? Why certainly, I think, it is that so finely described by Mr. Pope in the following eminently beautiful lines.

* The employment of the مشبه به to supply the place of the مشبه, as نرگس THE NAME OF A FLOWER, which is employed in the text to signify THE EYE, is not generally treated as a SIMILE by the Arabian Writers, who describe it as one species of the استعاره, or METAPHOR. Now the Arabian Writers are certainly in the right; but as a METAPHOR is merely "A short simile," or "A simile expressed by a single word,". I have not thought it necessary to distinguish between them, and have generally employed the term METAPHOR in the sense of a SIMILE, or vice versa, whether consisting of one or of many words.

So

So when the Sun's broad beams have tired the ſight,
All mild aſcends the Moon's more ſober light;
SERENE IN VIRGIN MODESTY SHE SHINES,
While unobſerved the glaring orb declines.

Now I have no intention to defend, broadly, the general purity of Perſian metaphors, many of which are certainly abſurd and remote in the higheſt degree; but ſince it cannot be denied that the ſame metaphor will often convey the oppoſite ſenſations of delight or diſtaſte, according to the aſpect under which it is viewed, it becomes a matter of juſtice to the Perſian Poets, to pauſe on the meaning of each metaphor, and not to pronounce ſentence of condemnation, until the point of compariſon ſhall be firſt aſcertained. The reader who is guided by this principle, will not fail to find his reward in the diſcovery of many beauties imperceptible to the eye of a common obſerver, to whom the fineſt metaphors of the language are obſcured or diſtorted by the miſt of his own ignorance; and he will ſpeedily perceive a very prominent diſtinction between the ſimiles of the Engliſh and the Perſian Language, the nature of which I am now to explain, if it has not been already divined by the reader.

IT is enough, I believe, to ſtamp the character of a good ſimile, that there ſhall exiſt in the مُشَبَّهٌ بِهِ, ſome ONE ATTRIBUTE OR PROMINENT QUALITY, on which alone the ſimile is founded; and there is not the leaſt occaſion that the مُشَبَّهٌ ſhall reſemble the مُشَبَّهٌ بِهِ, in any one of its other qualities. Thus a Poet, ſpeaking of a warrior in the field, might certainly deſcribe him as a "LION rouſed in his ſtrength;" &c. but no man in his ſenſes would thence infer that the Poet means to impute to his hero, *all* the qualities that diſtinguiſh a LION; but merely thoſe prominent qualities of STRENGTH and COURAGE, on which alone the ſimile is founded. The common uſage of the Engliſh Language does, nevertheleſs, in this example

as in most others, require that the resemblance between the مُشَبَّه, and the مُشَبَّه بِه shall be of a much more obvious, general and extensive nature than is necessary to the accuracy of a Persian simile; and thence it happens that the مُشَبَّه بِه is generally presented IN TOTO to the mind of an English reader, while the Persian Poet thinks of nothing but that SINGLE QUALITY in the مُشَبَّه بِه, on which alone the simile is founded.

To explain by an example. The term شَمْع A CANDLE, among the Persian Poets, is commonly employed to signify, a beautiful woman; and nothing surely can be more repugnant than such a metaphor, to the idiom and genius of the English Language: آمد آن شمع شبی "That CANDLE approached me one night;" &c. But the epithet مجلس افروز GIVING LIGHT TO THE ASSEMBLY, might be certainly applied in our Language to a beautiful woman; (" O! she doth teach the torches to burn bright;" &c.) and this is the only attribute of a candle, that enters into the mind of the Persian Poet, who takes occasion to apply the term شَمْع to his mistress. In this point of view, the term شَمْع, so applied, has perhaps unexceptionable propriety; but whatever judgment may be formed of its beauty, we are bound, in common candor, to admit that the Persian Poet is not responsible for the ignorance of his English reader, who extends the comparison a great deal too far, ascribing, perhaps, every other attribute of a candle to the Poet's mistress; such as shape, color, &c. and forgetting only that single attribute, (مُجْلِس افروزی) which forms, in reality, the وَجْهِ تَشْبِيه or true " Point of comparison;" and is alone present to the Poet's mind. Such are the errors of conception, into which men fall, who will not take the pains to distinguish, in Language, the influence of idiom, from that of reason; and are consequently apt to impute absurdity to every phrase, in a foreign Language, which is at va-

riance,

riance, not with the principles of ſound reaſon, but merely with the idiom of their native Tongue. I return from this digreſſion, in order to detail, in the form of general rules, the few obſervations that occur on the ſubject of the proper application of the word چون Like, to the purpoſes of Speech.

RULE FIRST.

The word چون Like, is very commonly employed to eſtabliſh the similitude between the مشبه and the مشبه به, when both ſhall happen to be مفرد; the term مفرد being oppoſed, in point of ſenſe, to the term جمله; and conſequently applicable to a ſingle noun, or to any part of a ſentence which is leſs than the whole. Examples: یارم چون قمر است "My miſtreſs is like the moon;" رخ یار چون گلنار است "The cheeks of my beloved reſemble the flower of the pomegranate;" عاشق بی زر چون مرغ بی پر است "A lover without money, is like a bird without feathers;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

The word چون Like, is very commonly employed to eſtabliſh the Similitude between the مشبه and the مشبه به, when the former ſhall be a جمله, and the latter a مفرد. Examples: در شب فراقش چون شمع می گدازم "During the nights of her abſence, I burn like a candle;" &c. In this caſe, the مشبه به generally occurs in the middle of a ſentence; except in poetry, where it may occur any where. Examples: چو مرغان خزان دیده زبان بست از سخن جامی "Jaumee has ceaſed to ſing, like the birds in autumn;" خلقی بعیش خنده زنان در چمن چو گل "The people are laughing in the garden, like the roſe;" &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

When the مشبه happens to be a مفرد, the مشبه به will rarely be a مرکب in the Persian Language; though some examples of that kind might be found or made: as زید را دیدم چون شیر بر آهوان تازد "I saw Zyde (rush on his enemies) as a lion rushes on a stag;" &c. In this case, the common usage of the Persian Language requires the use of the particle که: زید را در معرکه دیدم چون شیری که بر آهوان تازد "I saw Zyde in the field of battle, (rush on his enemies,) as a lion that rushes on the hind;" &c. or the use of an adjective or compound epithet: as دلم در فراقش چون ماهی از آب دور افتاده "My heart, in her absence, resembles a fish out of the water;" &c. And in either case, the مشبه به ceases to be a مرکب, and becomes a مفرد as already explained.

RULE FOURTH.

In a simile formed of two perfect sentences, one of which is the مشبه, and the other the مشبه به, the word چون Like will be rarely employed, except in poetry. Example: سکندر بلرزید از آن باد گرد "Alexander trembled at that whirlwind;" چو برگ خزان لرزد از باد سرد "As a leaf in autumn trembles at the wind;" &c. The common usage of the Persian Language requires, in this case, the use of the particle که after the مشبه به. Example: ذرات کائنات بمهر تو قایم اند "The atoms of existence are supported by thee;" (literally, "by thy Sun," because atoms are visible only in the rays of the Sun;) چون عالم صفات که قایم بود بذات "As the attributes of matter, (such as length, breadth, &c.) are supported by the matter in which they exist."

CONCLUSION.

The nature of a simile implies a distinction between the مشبّه, and the مشبّه به; because, in strict accuracy, a thing cannot be compared with itself, though some examples of that kind have been discovered and ridiculed in English poetry: as "None but himself can be his parallel." The incontestible absurdity of this phrase consists, I suppose, in the form of expression; for the idea of the writer is very clearly conveyed; *namely*, that "The person alluded to, has no equal;" and in this, there is no absurdity at all. I say the idea of the writer is very clearly conveyed, because the act of comparing a man with himself, is merely a form of hyperbole, introduced for an obvious purpose of speech; *namely*, that of indicating that there is not, in the world, an object with which he can be justly compared. In the Persian Lauguage, and I believe in every other Tongue, it often happens that the مشبّه and the مشبّه به are in reality descriptive of the same object; and, in this case, we have the *form* but not the *substance* of a simile; which always implies, as already stated, a distinction between the مشبّه and the مشبّه به. Thus we may say of a man that "Having an understanding such as he possesses," or "Having a mind like his mind, it is quite incredible that he should have been guilty of the follies imputed to him;" and as the man cannot possibly have two minds, one of which is compared to the other, it follows obviously, that there is not here the *substance* but merely the *form* of a simile, because the mind of the man is compared with itself. The examples of this nature are very numerous in the Persian Language: as شفیعی چون من و چون او غلامی "With such an intercessor as I am, and such a servant as he is;" چو تو خسروی کمتر ز جامی "And such a king as you are, shall we fail in our object, which is a mere trifle?" or literally, "which

"which is less than a glass of wine." The words "shall we fail in our object," are omitted in the original, with the usual brevity of the Persian Poets, which is often such as to obscure the sense. I have nothing more to observe on the nature and application of the word چون Like; often contracted in poetry into چو; and shall now proceed to consider, in their order, the numerous compounds that are formed from it.

همچون Like.

The application of this word to the purposes of speech, is precisely similar to that of چون; *insomuch that either may be* accurately substituted for the other in every example that can be adduced. Example: صبح دولت می دمد کو جام همچون آفتاب "The morning of fortune dawns upon me, bring me a cup that resembles the Sun;" &c. The word چون, however, is perhaps most commonly translated by مثل Like; in opposition to همچون, which is most commonly translated by the word مانند Resembling. I know not why it should be so, nor whether the fact does, in reality, constitute any essential distinction between them. It seems to me that the word همچون *has in it* somewhat more of force and emphasis than the word چون.

چنان چنون چنو چونان چونه
چنین چونین

These are various forms of the words چنان and چنین, which are alone commonly employed in the Language; the other forms being chiefly or entirely restricted to the writings of the ancient Poets. Examples: نگویم کش چنان باد و چنون باد "I do not pray that he may be so and so;" جهانداری چنو بر تخت ننشست "A Prince like him never sat on a throne;" قصرهای قیصر این روم همچونان بود "Such are the palaces of the

the CÆSARS of ROME ;" چنین بود گیتی و چونین بود " Such the world has always been, and such it will always continue to be ;" &c. It is unneceſſary to inform the reader that they are compounded of the word چون LIKE, and the demonſtrative nouns آن THAT, and این THIS ; with the exception, perhaps, of the word چنو ; in which the demonſtrative nouns are probably ſuperceded by the pronoun او HE, SHE, or IT. The word چونا, has been always of rare occurrence in the Language, and may be now regarded as completely obſolete.

THE demonſtrative nouns naturally imply a reference to the مشار الیه ; and if the latter ſhall happen to be expreſſed in the ſentence, it may be a ſingle noun: as, چنان کس در جهان پیدا نیست " There is no ſuch man as that in the world ;" و چنین آدم در عالم نبوید آمد " Nor any ſuch man as this in the univerſe ;" or it may be the ſenſe of a ſentence : as هر چه زید می کند بکر نیز چنان می تواند کرد ، " Whatever ZYDE does, *that*, or *ſuch as that*, BUKR can do alſo ;" where the demonſtrative THAT, which forms a component part of the word چنان, is obviouſly applicable to the ſenſe of the preceding ſentence هر چه زید می کند " Whatever ZYDE does ;" or, in other words, " to the actions of ZYDE." In either of theſe caſes, the practical application of the words چنان and چنین to the purpoſes of Speech, is of a nature too plain to admit of illuſtration by the rules of Grammar.

BUT it ſometimes happens that there is nothing, either expreſſed or underſtood in the ſentence, to which the ſenſe of the demonſtrative nouns compriſed in the words چنان and چنین, can be accurately and eaſily referred : as in the example :

ample: با زید چنان و چنین گفتم "I said such and such things to ZYDE;" &c. The words چنان and چنین, so employed, have been assigned by the Persian Grammarians to the class of the کنایات; (SEE PAGE 147, OF THIS VOLUME;) and they really convey no distinct information of any kind, being intelligible, like other words of that class, such as فلان A CERTAIN PERSON OR THING, &c. to those only who have some previous knowledge of the persons or things to which we allude. The obscurity *inherent in all such* phrases may, nevertheless, be *partially* removed by the introduction of a given substantive noun which is, therefore termed the تمییز. (SEE PAGE 223 OF THIS VOLUME,) as چنان اسب بزید بخشیدم "I gave such and such a horse to ZYDE;" or it may be wholly destroyed by means of a sentence following the particle که: as چنان سنگش زنم بر سر که مغز سرش در دهان افتد "I will so beat his head with a stone, that his brains shall fall into his mouth;" &c.

آنچنان   اینچنین   همچنان   همچنین

THE words آنچنان and اینچنین are undistinguished in their application, so far as I have been able to observe, from the simpler forms چنان and چنین: and the same observation may be extended to همچنان, and همچنین, which have, however, somewhat more of force and emphasis than the former. Example: ظاهر حالش به نعمت دنیا آراسته "His outward condition was adorned with the wealth of the world;" و خست نفس جبلی همچنان در وی متمکن "But his natural meanness of soul continued JUST as before;" &c.

چشانم

چنانکه · چنانچه

These two words are nearly ſynonimous, and are now of conſtant occurrence in the Language, though one of them (چنانچه) ſeems to have been rarely uſed by the writers of ancient Perſia. The following are all the rules that I have been able to collect in the Language, on the ſubject of their application to the purpoſes of Speech.

RULE FIRST.

They are very commonly employed to compare together the ſenſe of two ſentences, one of which is the مشبه, and the other the مشبه به. Example:

ناگاه از ظلمت دهلیز خانه روشنائی بتافت "Suddenly a light ſhone from amidſt the darkneſs of the lobby of the houſe;" چنانکه در شب تاری صبح بر آید "As the morning dawns after a dark night;" یا آب حیات از ظلمات بدر آید "Or as the water of life emerges from the midſt of darkneſs." In this caſe, the ſentence compriſing the مشبه به may precede the other which contains the مشبه: as

چنانکه تو منحوس هستی در جهان کسی منحوس نباشد "There is not in the world ſuch an unfortunate as you;" &c. And a part of the ſentence compriſing the مشبه به may be accurately omitted, if it be of ſuch a nature that the reader is able to ſupply the omiſſion. Example:

با هیچ کدام ایشان میلی و محبتی ندارد "He does not love any of them;" چنانکه با ایاز "So much as he loves Ayauz;" &c. The following is an example of the occurrence of چنانچه in the ſame ſenſe. فرمود تا دخمهٔ نوشیروان بکشایند "He gave orders to open the tomb of Nowsherawaun;" وبدانجا در آمد ودید تازه در خاک خفته "And having entered it, he

ſaw the body freſh and uncorrupted;"
چنانچه شخصی در خواب باشد "As a man who ſleeps;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

THEY are commonly employed to indicate the relation of EXEMPLIFICATION, known in Grammar by the term تمثیل. Example: هر اسمی که در آخرش های مختفی باشد "Every noun ending in the gentle aſpirate; عند الانتساب بکاف عجمی مبدل گردد forms the relative by changing that letter into *Gauf*:" چنانچه دیوانگی "as for example دیوانگی;" which is formed from دیوانه MAD. This relation approaches very nearly to that ſignified by the term تشبیه or COMPARISON; with this difference, that the مشبه به, in the caſe of تمثیل, is an example adduced in illuſtration of a given rule, or a given obſervation; which is not *true* of a common ſimile, in which two things are merely compared together.

RULE THIRD.

THEY may be accurately employed *to combine together two* ſentences connected by the relation of CAUSE and EFFECT. Example: روزی از بام تا شام رفتم "I walked one day from morning to night;" چنانکه مانده و کوفته شدم "Inſomuch that I was fatigued and weary;" &c. Or to indicate the relation ſignified by the terms غایت و غرض: in which caſe, they are followed, like the PARTICLE تا, by a ſentence ſignificant of the END or PURPOSE for which a given action is to be, or may have been, performed. Example: عیب کسی مگو چنانچه عیب تو هم کسی نگوید "Do not cenſure other men, that they may not cenſure you;" &c.

RULE

RULE FOURTH.

THEY are very commonly employed to indicate the HOPE OR DESIRE of the Speaker for the occurrence of a given event, signified by the sentence to which they are prefixed: and in this case, they correspond very nearly, in point of sense, with the word کاشکی WOULD IT WERE SO; OR WOULD IT MAY BE SO; &c. Examples: اگر چنانچه متعرض ما نشوی "If (would it were so) you will consent not to give us any trouble," و هر روز وقت ما را پریشان نسازی "And not daily to destroy our comfort," ما شکاری به هنگام چاشت و تهیهٔ مطبخ ملک می فرستیم "We will send you every morning game sufficient for the provision of your Majesty's kitchen." اگر چنانچه توجه خاطر باتمام آن پردازند "If (would it were so) you will direct the attention of your mind to the completion of it;" &c. The words باید و شاید are most probably understood in all the Examples of this class, after the word چنانچه which does not therefore, in all probability, suffer any real fluctuation of sense.

RULE FIFTH.

THEY are not unfrequently employed to indicate the PROXIMITY, in point of time, of the occurrence of two given events comprised in either member of the sentence by which they are followed: and in this case, they correspond very nearly, in point of sense, with the word چون WHEN, as already explained. Example: چنانچه زید آمد صبح دمید "As ZYDE arrived," or "When ZYDE arrived, the morning broke;" &c.

RULE SIXTH.

THE words همچنانکه and همچنانچه have somewhat more of force and emphasis than the simpler forms چنانکه ; چنانچه ; but the word

word چنانچه is of rare occurrence except in the writings of modern times. Examples: دیدهٔ اهل طمع به نعمت دنیا "The eyes of the avaricious (cannot be filled) by the wealth of this world;" پر نشود همچنانکه چاه به شبنم "As a well cannot be filled with nightly dew." همچنانچه بضرب تیغ جهان سوز "As by the strokes of your sword destroying the world," ساحت سرای فانی را در قید ضبط می آری "you bring under subjection the expanse of this transitory world;" به برکت عدل عالم افروز "So, by the means of your justice enlightening the world," ملک سعادت باقی را هم در قبضهٔ استحقاق در آوری "You ought to bring under subjection to the grasp of your merit, the kingdom of eternal happiness in a future state;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

Having furnished the preceding examples of the practical application of the words چنانکه and چنانچه to the purposes of speech, *it remains for me to observe*, as *usual*, that I am very indifferent about the decision of the *question that relates to the* UNITY or OTHERWISE, of the sense of these words, in every example that can be adduced. I am as much disposed as any of my readers, to believe that they have no real fluctuations of sense; but however that question may be decided, the utility of the examples adduced by me will be equally defensible in either case: since those examples unquestionably furnish the facts, with reference to which, our opinions on the subject must be ultimately formed.

It is worthy of remark that there are no such words in the Language as چنینکه and چنینچه; though the analogous formation of چنانکه and چنانچه might reasonably give birth to an expectation

pectation of their existence. The particle کر, occurring after the word چنین, does not therefore coalesce with that word: چنین کر یار مرا روی خوب وخوی نیکوست "Such is the beautiful face and fine temper of my beloved;" &c. nor does that particle coalesce with چنان, when the word چنان is employed as a کنایه: as چون سخت و درشت شد چنان کر ذکاری نشاید "When he becomes rough and disagreeable, or loses the beauty and softness of youth, so that he is no longer an object of desire;" &c. In either case, the following is the natural order of the sentence: چنین روی خوب کر یار مراست; چنان سخت و درشت شد کر نگاری نشاید; &c. I have nothing more to observe on the practical application of the derivatives formed from the word چون; and shall proceed, therefore, to consider the nature and application of the word خدا.

خدا

As a noun, this word is properly the name of the DEITY: in which sense, some Etymologists consider it as a contraction for خود آی COMING OF HIS OWN ACCORD; or UNCREATED. Compounded with another word, it has the sense of LORD; MASTER; PROPRIETOR; &c. as خانه خدا "The master of the house;" کشور خدا "The ruler of the kingdom;" ده خدا "The lord of the village;" کد خدا or کتخدا "The master of the house;" نا خدا "The captain of a ship;" &c. N. B. The word کد or کت signifies A HOUSE; and نا is a contraction for ناو A SHIP or A BOAT.

خر

As a common substantive noun, this word signifies AN ASS; but it is prefixed to a considerable number of words in the Language, in the sense of LARGE; COARSE; &c. as خرتوت

A LARGE MULBERRY; خرسنگ A LARGE STONE; خرموش A LARGE MOUSE; OR A RAT; خرمگس A LARGE FLY; خرچنگ A CRAB; (because of his large claws;) خرمن, a contraction for خرآمن A LARGE HEAP OF ANY THING, but more especially of GRAIN; خربزه properly A LARGE FRUIT; but now A WATER-MELON; though some people pronounce the word خربزه; because they believe it to be a contraction for خور پزه RIPENED BY THE SUN.

دار.

THIS is the contracted form of the participle دارنده; as مالدار WEALTHY; بوی دار ODORIFEROUS; پرده دار HOLDING THE VEIL; دیده دار A SENTINEL, or "One stationed to keep watch on an eminence;" راه دار "An officer having charge of the public roads;" خویشتن دار "One who keeps himself clear of evil;" &c. as کسی بهتر از خویشتن دار نیست "There is no man better than he is, who keeps himself clear of evil."

در IN.

THIS word, though now generally considered as a particle, was probably a ظرف in former times; being followed, in that character, by the mark of the IZAFUT; like the word درون, WITHIN, which is now a ظرف, and therefore indispensibly requires that mark. Ex: نگه کرد موری در غله دید "He looked and beheld an ant in the grain;" &c. The mark of the IZAFUT is now generally omitted after در, which is therefore thought to have assumed the character of a PARTICLE; whether accurately or otherwise, I leave to be determined by the judgment of the reader; *first*, because I think it a matter of little importance whether we call it a

NOUN

NOUN OR A PARTICLE; and, *secondly*, becauſe I am really at ſome loſs to form a decided opinion on the ſubject. Mr. TOOKE's diſciples will probably trace its origin to the ſubſtantive در, A DOOR; but admitting the accuracy of that etymology, it is entirely unimportant in my eſtimation. I do not believe that the word در, IN, ſuffers any real fluctuations of ſenſe; but think it neceſſary, nevertheleſs, to offer in the form of general rules, ſuch obſervations as occur on the ſubject of its practical uſe.

RULE FIRST.

THE PROPER and the IMPROPER ZURF, as explained in CHAPTER FIRST, PAGE 122 OF THIS VOLUME, are very commonly governed by the prepoſition در, IN; which denotes, in this caſe, the relation ſignified by the term ظرفیت; connecting together the مظروف or THING CONTAINED, and the ظرف or THAT IN WHICH IT IS CONTAINED. Example: زید در خانه است "ZYDE is in the houſe;" یار را در باغ بردم "I took my friend into the garden;" در روز رسیدم "I arrived in the day;" در شب آرمیدم "I ſlept or reſted in the night;" نظر در رخ یار کردم "I looked at or in the face of my beloved;" در فکر فرو رفتم "I was loſt in thought;" در بلا گرفتار شدم "I was involved in miſery;" &c. This is the true ſenſe of the word در; to which, in all probability, the examples detailed in the following rules might be accurately and reaſonably referred.

RULE SECOND.

IT is found, occaſionally, to denote the relation of ASSOCIATION; known in Grammar by the term مصاحبت. Example: در کوفه با یاری نیکو رسیدم "I arrived at Koofa in company with

a caravan;" &c. Or the relation of EXALTATION, known in Grammar by the term استعلا, and more commonly ſignified by the word بر ON. Examples:

در اوج لطافت چو تو زیبا قمری نیست "There is no ſuch moon as you are, ſhining IN or ON the ſummit of all *that* is graceful;" کلاه در سر کردم "I put the cap ON (literally IN) my head;" انگشتري در انگشت کردم "I put the ring ON (literally IN) my finger." In the two laſt examples, it is worthy of remark that the ظرف and the مظروف have changed places; ſince we put our head in a cap, and not the cap in our head; &c.

RULE THIRD.

IT is found, occaſionally, to denote the relation of CAUSATION; known in Grammar by the term سببیت, and more commonly ſignified by the word از. Example: در عشق تو رسوای جهان شدم "I have become the ſcorn of the world becauſe of my love for you;" &c. Or that other ſpecies of CAUSATION, which is known, by the terms وغرض غایت. Example: در کشتن او سعی بی فایده نمودند "They laboured ineffectually to bring about his death; &c. Or the relation of JUNCTION; known in Grammar by the term الصاق, and more commonly ſignified by the prepoſition به. Example: دامن گل بریخت و در دامنم آویخت "He flung down the roſes, and laid hold of my lappet;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

IT is occaſionally employed to denote certain other ſpecific relations, the claſſification of which, after having furniſhed a few examples, I ſhall leave to be determined by the judgment of the reader, ſince the ſhades of difference between the

nature

nature of one ſpecific relation and another, are often ſo fine as to be nearly evaneſcent. Examples: زید در برادران چون ماه است در ستارگان "ZYDE among his brothers, reſembles the moon among the ſtars;" هم در تو گریزم ار گریزم "If I fly at all, I ſhall fly to you;" بوسی بده ای شمع که در پای تو میرام "Give me a kiſs, O my BELOVED! may I die at your feet;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE already ſtated my opinion that the word در has no real fluctuations of ſenſe, though the diverſity of idiom that obtains in the Engliſh and Perſian Tongues, does, undoubtedly, render it applicable to many propoſitions which cannot be accurately expreſſed in our Language by means of its ſynonime, the word IN. As applicable to the infinitive and the tenſes of a Perſian verb, the word در may be often a PLEONASM: as درگفتن "To ſpeak;" درگشودن "To open;" &c. or it may be often ſignificant; in which caſe, it is exactly oppoſed, in point of ſenſe, to the word بر: as در آمدن To come in; or To enter; بر آمدن To come out; or To come forth; در آوردن To bring in; بر آوردن To bring out; &c.

وش دیس LIKE.

THESE two words were formerly ſelf-ſignificant, and for aught I know to the contrary, may be ſo ſtill. Example: ندید و نه بیند ترا هیچ کس "No man ever ſaw, or will ſee," گه رزم مثل و گه بزم وش "Your equal either in the field or cabinet." At preſent, they are of rare occurrence in the Language, being added, in the way of terminations, to the end of certain ſubſtantive nouns: as حوروش "Like

the

the ſun;" خلد و پلس "Like heaven;" تشدیس or تشدیس "Like the body;" and therefore "A picture:" as بر او نشین بر و نشر از و سکو بو هزار "In it, were a thouſand various forms and pictures of beautiful women;" &c.

دیو, A Demon.

In the ſenſe of A DEMON, this word is the root or primitive from which is formed دیوک or دیوچه "The name of an inſect deſtructive of books." It is otherwiſe employed, like the word خر, to ſignify Large, when prefixed to certain ſubſtantive nouns: as دیوکمان "A large bow;" دیوکلوخ "A large clod;" دیوپا "A ſpider;" because of the length or ſize of his legs; دیوباد "A tempeſt;" or "A whirlwind;" دیومشک "The name of a large ſpecies of grain;" &c.

را

The termination را has not, perhaps, any real fluctuations of ſenſe; being *invariably* employed *to indicate* the relation of APPROPRIATION, known in Grammar *by the term* اختصاص, and commonly expreſſed by the word برای For. To this general ſenſe of the termination را, it is probable, that every example of its occurrence in the Language may be accurately and reaſonably referred: as زیدرا زدم "I beat Zyde;" which is equivalent to the phraſe "I appropriated to Zyde, or performed on Zyde, the action ſignified by the verb To beat." (See Remarks, Page 199 of this Volume.) The relation of APPROPRIATION is very general, and may be therefore reſolved into a conſiderable number of ſpecific relations, the nature of which I ſhall endeavour to detail in the following rules.

RULE

RULE FIRST.

The termination را, is very commonly added to that noun which forms the مَفْعُولِ بِهِ, or true object of a tranſitive verb: and, in that caſe, the omiſſion or inſertion of the termination را, depends on the rules detailed in Chapter Seventh, Page 189, et seq: of this Volume, to which the reader is therefore referred. Example: زَيْدرا زَدَم "I beat Zyde;" بَكررا كُشتَم "I ſlew Bukr;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

It is occaſionally employed to indicate the relation of association, known in Grammar by the term مَعِيَّت, and more commonly ſignified by the prepoſition با. Examples: اِين حكايت شِنَو كه در بَغْداد "Hear this ſtory that in Baghdaud;" رايَت و پَرْدَه را خِلاف اُفْتاد "a diſpute took place between a flag and a piece of tapeſtry."
خَتْمُ الرُّسُل اَگَرْچه بجُود داد تَرا "Although the laſt of the prophets in his bounty has beſtowed upon you," آن نِسْبَتي كه داشْت هارُون كَلِيم را "the ſame relation to himſelf which Aaron had with Moses."
اَي صَد حِجاب لُطْف اَز گُل رُوي تو لالَه را "The roſe of your face puts the tulip to ſhame," مانَند غَزال چَشْم تو چَشْم غَزالَه را "And your eyes, ſparkling as thoſe of a fawn, reſemble the eye of the Sun;" &c. It muſt be obvious to the reader that the prepoſition با might accurately ſupercede the termination را, in all theſe examples: as با كَلِيم ; با چَشْم غَزالَه ; and ſo, alſo, in the phraſe با رايَت و پَرْدَه ; زَيْدرا گُفْتَم و فَرْمُودَم or بازَيْد گُفْتَم و فَرْمُودَم "I ſaid to, or ſpoke with Zyde;" &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

It is occaſionally employed to indicate the relation of CAUSATION, known in Grammar by the term سَبَبِيَت, and more commonly expreſſed by the prepoſition اَز. Example: چُنِين آدَمِي مُرْدَه بِه نَنْگ را " It is better that ſuch a man ſhould die of diſgrace;" that is to ſay, " by reaſon of diſgrace;" &c. It ſeems alſo to ſupply the place of the prepoſition اَز in other examples of a different nature: as زَيدْ را حِكَايَت كُنَنْد " It is related of ZYDE;" زَيدْ را پُرسِيدَنْد " They aſked ZYDE;" that is to ſay, " They aſked of ZYDE ſuch and ſuch queſtions;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It is occaſionally employed to indicate the relation of EXCHANGE OR OPPOSITION;" known in Grammar by the terms بَدَل و مُقَابَلَه. Example: هَزَار رُوپِيَه را اَسپِي خَرِيدَم " I purchaſed a horſe for a thouſand rupees;" &c. It is alſo pretty frequently *employed in the ſenſe of the prepoſitions* دَر and بَر. Examples: شَب را بِبُوستَان بَا يَكِي اَز دُوستَان اِتِّفَاقِ مَبِيت اُفتَاد " I happened to remain IN or FOR the night, in a garden with one of my friends;" رَحمِي بَر جَانِ سُلمَان كُن كِه رَحمَت وَاجِب اَست " Have compaſſion on the life or ſoul of SULMAN, for it behoves you to pity نَاتَوَانِي را كِه بَارَش اُفتَادَه دَر آب و گِل اَست a wretch whoſe load is fallen into the mud." (زِ رَحمَت وَاجِب اَست بَر نَاتَوَانِي) &c.

RULE FIFTH.

It is occaſionally employed to govern the noun by which we ſwear. Example: خَصم مِي گُويَد كِه شُكْر هَا مَر اَز نِيكُوان " My enemies

enemies say, HOOMAUM is given to the love of beautiful women;" راستی را هر که جان دارد بدیشان مایل است "And in truth, (I swear by truth,) whoever is possessed of a soul is disposed to love them." Or to govern a noun introduced for the purpose of indicating SURPRISE OR ASTONISHMENT. Example: دل از من برد و روی از من نهان کرد "She robbed me of my heart and withdrew from my sight;" خدا را با که این بازی توان کرد "Heavens! who is to be mocked in such a manner as this!" I know not whether the termination را, in the word قضا را, "By chance," or more properly "By the irrevocable decrees of Providence or Destiny," is not properly of the same nature. Example: قضا را طبیب اندر آن شب بمرد "As fate would have it, the physician died that night." In the following example, it seems to me to indicate the relation of ADJURATION: خدا را بر من بیدل ببخشای "For GOD's sake, have compassion on me who have lost my heart."

RULE SIXTH.

IT is often employed to supply the place of the IZAFUT: *first*, when any one or more words occur between the مضاف and the مضاف الیه, the former taking precedence in the order of Speech; and, *secondly*, when the مضاف الیه precedes the مضاف, with or without the intervention of any other word. Examples: تا رخ خوبت نه بینم دل نیاساید مرا "My heart will never be happy (دل من نیاساید) until I obtain a sight of your fine face;" عضد را پسر نیک رنجور بود "The son of AZOOD (پسر عضد) was very ill;" یکی را چو من دل بدست کسی "There was a man who, like me, had lost his heart to his mistress;" (دل یکی چون دل من الی آخره) &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

It is occaſionally employed to indicate the relation of JUNCTION; known in Grammar by the term اِلْصاق, and more commonly ſignified by the prepoſition بِ. Example: بمطلوب رسیدم or, which is the ſame thing, مطلوب را رسیدم "I attained my object." Of this nature, I believe, is the Example فلان کتاب زید را دادم و بخشیدم "I gave ſuch and ſuch a book to ZYDE;" &c. It occurs alſo in the ſenſe of نزد: as صبا لیلی ز موج حجاب دارو برزمی "Would that the morning breeze would *fling* aſide the veil that conceals the beauty of LYLEE;" تا خلایق را شود روشن که مجنون عاقل است "For then mankind might perceive (نزد خلایق روشن شود) that MUJNOON (is not frantic as they have ſuppoſed, and as the name implies, but) retains the poſſeſſion of all his faculties." In other words, "Such is the tranſcendent beauty of LYLEE, as to juſtify the apparently frantic actions of her lover MUJNOON." The reader will perceive that the lines have not been tranſlated literally. The termination را is alſo occaſionally employed in the *ſenſe of the word* جانب: as ملک باقی را روی آر "Turn your face to the kingdom of eternity;" &c.

RULE EIGHTH.

It is ſometimes employed to govern the noun ſignificant of the END OR PURPOSE (غایت و غرض) to be effected by the occurrence of a given event ſpecified in the ſentence with which it is connected. Example: حکمت محض است اگر لطف جهان آفرین "It is the higheſt benefit (wiſdom) if the bounty of the CREATOR;" خاص کند بنده مصلحت عام را "Selects one of his creatures for the general good;" &c. Or to indicate a CHANGE from

from one ſtate to another; known in Grammar by the term صیرورت. Example: ما همه مردن را پیدا شده ایم "We are all born to die;" و ویرانی را آبادان گشته ایم "And flouriſh, to decay;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

It ſeems to me that the relation of APPROPRIATION may be eaſily traced in all the examples adduced in illuſtration of the preceding rules, and in a great variety of other examples, perhaps too numerous to be compriſed in any Grammatical treatiſe whatever: as مرا کتاب لغت در کار است "I want a dictionary;" خواجه را بندهٔ نادر الحسن بود "A gentleman had a ſlave of extraordinary beauty;" گل بوستان را بقائی نیست "The roſes of the garden have no permanency;" شکر و سپاس و نعمت و منت خدای را "All praiſe and gratitude is due to God;" &c. I ſhall therefore only farther obſerve, on this ſubject, that the termination را, ſeems to be ſometimes, though rarely, a mere pleonaſm: as خرم آن فرخنده طالع را که چشم "Happy is that fortunate man whoſe eyes; اوفتد بر روی تو هر بامداد are every morning directed to your face;" unleſs (which is poſſible) the word خرم be here employed in the ſenſe of the ſubſtantive خرمی Happiness.

The intelligent reader will alter, if neceſſary, according to the dictates of his own judgment, the arrangement of the examples which I have adduced in order to illuſtrate the practical application of the termination را, to the purpoſes of Speech. He will ſupply, from his own obſervation, ſuch examples, omitted by me, as may be neceſſary to the more perfect elucidation of the ſubject; and having collected all the facts of the caſe, he will then

then proceed to adopt the arrangement, which I have proposed, or to substitute, if that shall be deemed adviseable, any other that may, in his estimation, furnish a nearer approximation to the truth. Believing that the plan which is here adopted in imitation of the writers on Arabic Grammar, is the very best that can be devised for the attainment of an accurate conception of the nature and use of the Persian particles, I am not the less conscious that its execution is defective in all probability, and therefore susceptible of much improvement. I have marked out the path which leads to success, but the reader who desires to pursue it with advantage, will have occasion for the exertion of his own industry, in the removal of those impediments which may have escaped the industry of my enquiries, and will therefore continue to to lie in his way.

ژنده ، ژند ،

Each of these words is commonly employed in the sense of Large: as ژنده پیل or ژند پیل "A large elephant;" ژنده رود "A large river;" &c. Ex. همی رفت تا زان سوی ژنده پیل "He rushed to assault that raging (or *literally large*) elephant;" خروشنده مانند دریای نیل "Roaring loud as the river Nile;" &c. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the word زنده Living, is the participle of the verb زیستن To live.

زیرا ،

This word has already been twice noticed in Pages 441 and 462 of this volume, to which the reader is therefore referred. It is generally followed by the particle که, but sometimes by چه: as زیرا که or زیرا چه; both words having precisely the same sense.

زینهار زنهار Have a care.

There is little to be ſaid of this word, which is employed to corroborate or confirm the propoſition compriſed in that member of the ſentence to which it is annexed. Examples: غم زیردستان بخور زینهار " Have a care that you conſole the weak or unfortunate;" زنهار مکن تکیه که بنیاد ندارد " Have a care that you do not depend (on fortune,) for it has no foundation;" &c. As a noun, it has various ſenſes: as زنهار خوار " A breaker of engagements;" زنهار خواه " One who demands protection; زینهار از قرین بد زنهار " Protect us (or literally, Protection!) againſt a bad wife;" &c. In the laſt example, I ſuppoſe the verb ده Give, or ſomething equivalent, is underſtood in the ſentence; and ſo, alſo, of other examples in which the word زینهار is followed by the prepoſition از.

زی Towards.

This word, which is of common occurrence in the Shah Namah and elſewhere, does not admit the mark of the Izafut, and has been therefore aſſigned to the claſs of particles. It is employed in the ſenſe of the word طرف. Example: بدیدار وی زی سپاهان شدم " I went to Ispahaun to ſee him;" &c.

سا Like.

This word is probably a contracted form of the word آسا Like: as پیل سا or پیل آسا " Like an elephant;" مشک سا " Like muſk;" &c. Example: چو شانه زند طرهٔ مشک سا " When ſhe combs her hair black and fragrant as muſk;" نسیم ختن گو بیا مشک سا " Let the breeze of Khooten advance and ſteal odour;" (more delightful than its own.)

N. B. The word سا, in the second line, is plainly the imperative of the verb سودن or سایيدن To rub or To wear.

سار

This is another form of the word سر: as نگون سار for نگون سر "Inverted;" سبکسار for سبکسر "Light headed;" سار ان "The upper end;" as opposed to پایان "The lower end of any thing;" &c. Example: بگور ستان بزیر خشت ببنگر "Look into the graves under the tombs;" که نشناسی تو سرزان زپایان "And you will not be able to distinguish the head from the feet of those who are buried;" &c. The word سار is also employed as a termination, in the sense of like: as دیوسار "Like a Demon;" زیرک سار "Like an intelligent man;" سگسار "Like a dog in disposition;" مارسار "Like a snake;" an epithet applicable to the Persian king ضحاک, from whose shoulders, touched by the Devil, grew two living snakes that could be fed only by the brains of children.

سان

This word is also employed as a termination in the sense of like: as شیرسان "Like a lion;" سایه سان "Like a shadow;" لاله سان "Like a tulip;" یکسان "Like one or the same thing;" همسان "Resembling each other;" &c. Example: لاله سان داغ تو بر دل زدوی دشت را کنم "I shall go into the fields, my heart streaked like the tulip, with the impression of grief occasioned by the love which I bear to you;" &c.

شاه

The word شاه, properly a King, is commonly prefixed to other words in the sense of large or excellent; being opposed

oppofed, in this refpect, to the word خرد, which fignifies LARGE OR COARSE, as already ftated in treating of that word. Example: شاه راه "A large road or highway;" شاه تير "The large beams of a houfe;" شاه ناى "A large wind inftrument of mufic;" شاه توت "A large and excellent mulberry;" شاه سوار "A good horfeman;" شاه بوى "Ambergris;" (becaufe of its excellent odour;) &c. The word شاه is often contracted into شه: as راه is into ره; چاه into چه; &c.

غير OTHER.

THE application of this word to the purpofes of Speech, is very nearly the fame with that of the Perfian جز, already noticed in PAGE 489 OF THIS VOLUME, to which the reader is therefore referred. Example: غير آه گرم نبود هيچ دل سوزى مرا "I have no friend but only my fighs;" وانكه مى گريد بحالم چشم گريان من است "And none to weep for me but my own eyes." The word جز muft be followed by the مضاف اليه, which is often omitted after غير: as احدى و غيرى را دشمن نمى گيرم "I confider no man as my enemy;" فلان غير است دوست نيست "Such a man is a ftranger not a friend;" &c. The word غير is generally followed by the mark of the IZAFUT, which is not true of the word جز; but both may follow the particle به, and may be followed, themfelves, by the particle از, which then fupplies the place of the IZAFUT: as بغير ازين; بغير از نام تو; بغير او; &c. Examples:

مبادا كس در پى آزار و هرچه خواهى كن "Do evil to none, and in every thing elfe, follow the bent of your own inclination;" كه در شريعت ما غير ازين گناهى نيست "For according to our principles, nothing is faulty but this alone." Generally fpeaking,

speaking, either of the words خنبر or صبیر may accurately supply the place of the other, in the common usage of the Persian Langnage.

THIS is another form of the preposition با WITH; the first letter having suffered a permutation which is pretty common to the Language: as زُفان for زبان "The tongue;" &c. Example: جادوی کم پیر از غصه بمرد "The decrepit old juggler died in distress;" روان نکوهی زشت فا مالک سپرد "And committed his vicious spirit to MAULIK;" (the name of the angel who has charge of Hell.) There are other examples of the same nature: as فا او گفتم "I spoke with him;" فا او رفتم "I went away with him;" &c. Of the occurrence of فا, as another form of the word وا, the following example may be adduced: بسیمرغ وار گوشه نشینم نه چون مگس "I shall dwell in retirement like the SEEMOORGH, and will not, like the fly, بنشینم از حریصی بهر جا که فا رسم alight wherever I go, from motives of avarice, or a greedy disposition." I conceive the words فا رسم are here employed for وارسم, or perhaps for برسم, which seems to be the opinion of the author of the SOOROOREE.

THESE terminations, added to the end of certain substantive nouns, have the sense of رنگ COLOR: as مشک فام or مشک وام "Black as musk;" گل فام "Red as the rose;" نیل فام "Blue;" &c. Example: مرا همچنین چهره گل فام بود "I had then a face that might vie in color with the rose;" &c.

مرا

I have little to say of this word, because I have no very clear conception of its nature. It seems to have occasionally the sense of بر and ور: as دامن فتنه چو دستار فرا سر پیچم "I will place the lappet of mischief on my head as a turban;" همه را فرا هم (و فرا هم) کردم "I collected them all together;" &c. As a noun, it has been said to convey occasionally the sense, *first*, of the words فوق or بالا Above; or High: as بگفت فراتر مجالم نماند "He said, I can fly no higher;" *secondly*, of the words پیش Before; or نزدیک Near: as فرا رفت و گفت ای عجب این تویی "He advanced or approached, and said, O wonderful! can this be you?" *thirdly*, of the word دور Far: as فرا رفت "He went a great way;" and *finally*, of the words همه or تمام All: as مال خود را از زید فرا گرفتم "I took all my property out of the hands of Zyde;" &c. It is also frequently employed as a pleonasm: as فرا پوشیدن "To conceal;" or "To cover;" &c.

فرو.

When significant, this word seems to have the sense of the word زیر Under; being directly opposed to the particle بر: as هر نفسی که فرو میرود ممد حیات است "Every breath we inhale, adds length to our life;" و چون بر می آید مفرح ذات "And gives joy to the soul, when again exhaled;" &c. The word فرو is often a pleonasm, before the infinitive and tenses of a Persian verb: as فرو گفتن "To speak;" فرو شنیدن "To hear;" &c. &c.

وش

THIS word, added to the end of certain nouns, has the sense of LIKE: as شاه وش "Like a King;" شیروش "Like a Lion;" ماروش "Like a snake;" an epithet often applied to the Persian King ضحّاک, of whom I have already had occasion to speak.

فی الجمله IN SHORT; OR IN SUBSTANCE.

THERE is little to be observed on the practical application of this word, or more properly of this phrase, to the purposes of Speech. It is generally employed as a sort of کلمهٔ اقتضائی (SEE PAGE 465 OF THIS VOLUME,) when the speaker, passing over details of inferior moment, is desirous at once to come to the point. Examples: دوستانِ جسیم از کلمهٔ حق خاموش شدند "My best friends did not venture to defend my character by stating the truth;" و صحبتِ دیرینه فراموش کردند "And they forgot (or neglected) the duties imposed by their long established intimacy with me;" فی الجمله بانواع عقوبت گرفتار شدم "In short, I was involved in difficulties of every kind;" &c. In modern times the phrase فی الجمله is often employed in the sense of اندکی: as فی الجمله A LITTLE: in answer to the question آیا در زبانِ فارسی مهارتی دارید "Have you any skill in the Persian Language?" &c.

فقط

THIS word is compounded of the Arabic particle (or letter) فَ THEN, and the word قطّ, which signifies ENOUGH. Its occurrence in the Persian Language is chiefly or entirely restricted to the

the compositions of modern times. Example: ترا مي خواهم فقط "I wish for you alone;" و ديگري را نمي دانم "And have nothing to do with any body else;" بارا الغنا وفقط بر ذات خدا است "I have no dependence but on God alone;" &c.

كاش كاج كاشكي كاجكي

Would it were so; or would it may be so.

These are various forms of the same word; or perhaps كاشكي and كاجكي are compounded of كاش and كاج, followed by the particle كه That, which seems to have been anciently written كي. They indicate the wishes of the speaker; and are therefore followed by a given proposition, significant of the nature of such wishes. Now there is no limit to the wishes of the human mind, which are indifferently extended to past or future time, and to all imaginable objects, as well those which we hope to attain, as those which we know to be unattainable. Accordingly, the proposition following the word كاش and its synonimes, is often referrable, *first*, to past time: as مرا اي كاشكي مادر نزادي "Would that my mother had never bore me;" وگر مي زاد كس شيرم ندادي "Or that the nurse had never fed me with milk!" Or, *secondly*, it is referrable to future time, but still significant of an object which we know to be unattainable: as كاج زيد كاري نميرد "Would that Zyde may never die;" &c. Or, *finally*, it is significant of an object which we believe or presume to be attainable: as گذارش بر سر خاك من افتد كاش در محشر "Grant Heaven! she may pass over my ashes on the day of resurrection;" كه چون از خاك بر خيزم رسد دستم بدامانش "That when I rise from the dust, I may touch her garment;" &c. (N. B. The poet does not hope for the attainment of so much happiness at any *earlier* period of time.) It is only necessary to

add.

add, that we cannot accurately wish for that which we know to be of certain occurrence; whence it follows, that we never say "Would the SUN may rise this morning!" because we know very well that the SUN will rise.

لا No.

THIS Arabic word is pretty frequently employed in the Persian Language to answer, in the negative, a proposition expressed in the affirmative form. Example: گفت هیچ از نحو خواندی گفت لا "Have you ever (said the Grammarian) learnt any syntax?" "No!" (replied the Boat-man;) گفت نیم عمرت شد در فنا "Then, (said the Grammarian,) half of your life has been passed in vain;" &c.

لیکن ولیکن لیک ولیک ولی BUT.

THESE are various forms of the word لیکن, or ولیکن having the particle و, prefixed. The Persians have borrowed this word from the Arabs, by whom it is variously written لکن ; ولکن ; لکنّ ; ولکنّ; And after LAUM, there is a broad ALIF uttered but not written, (or written generally above the line,) which has been converted by the Persians into YA MUJHOOL.

THE world لیکن is commonly employed to indicate the relation signified by the term استدراک, and has perhaps no real fluctuations of sense. The term استدراک literally signifies DISCOVERY; and, in its technical sense, it means "the removal, by one proposition, of a doubt engendered by the utterance of another." The two propositions are connected together by means of the word لیکن BUT; and they must

be

be ſomehow or other OPPOSED to each other in point of ſenſe. The nature of this oppoſition is perhaps too various to admit of much illuſtration by the rules of Grammar, yet I am anxious to render it as clear as poſſible, and the examples detailed in the following rules may poſſibly ſerve to throw light on the ſubject.

RULE FIRST.

THE oppoſition of ſenſe, between two propoſitions connected together by means of the word لیکن BUT, may conſiſt in what has been termed تناقض; and this happens, when the predicate of either propoſition denotes the negation of the SAME ATTRIBUTE, which is applicable, in the affirmative, to the other propoſition. In this caſe, the ſubject of both propoſitions cannot be the ſame. Examples: زید آمد لیکن عمرو نیامد "ZYDE is come, but AMR is not come;" نماند حاتم طائی ولیک تا ابد "HAUTIME TAUEE lives no longer, but to all eternity without end;" بماند نام بلندش به نیکوئی مشهور "His name, celebrated for virtue, will continue to endure;" &c. Or, if the predicate of either propoſition be directly oppoſed to that of the other in point of ſenſe, they will be ſtill connected by the word لیکن, becauſe FOLLY is merely a negation of WISDOM; and IGNORANCE is merely a negation of KNOWLEDGE; &c. Example: زید متحرک است لیکن عمرو ساکن است "ZYDE is moving, but AMR is at reſt;" &c.

RULE SECOND.

THE oppoſition of ſenſe, between two propoſitions connected together by means of the word لیکن BUT, may conſiſt in what has been termed تضادّ; and this happens, when

the predicate of either propoſition is ſignificant of an attribute DIFFERENT from that ſignified by the other, but not abſolutely of a contrary nature. In this caſe, the ſubject of both propoſitions may be the ſame; but if they happen to be ſo, the one will be affirmative, and the other negative. Example: زید شجاع نیست لیکن سخی است "ZYDE is not brave, but he is liberal;" or, by transferring the negative to the ſecond propoſition, "ZYDE is brave but he is not liberal;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

WHEN the predicate of either propoſition happens to be ſignificant of the ſame attribute, an oppoſition of ſenſe may yet be obtained by having recourſe to the DEGREES OF COMPARISON: as زید ترا دوست می دارد "ZYDE is attached to you as a friend;" ولیکن من ترا دوست تر می دارم "But I love you better than he does." Or to furniſh the authority of the Poet FUKHREE: مشتاق دیدار تو اند اهل نظر لیک "The admirers of beauty deſire to behold you;" از فخری دلسوخته مشتاق تری نیست "But there are none who deſire it more than FUKHREE;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

THE ſame predicate being applicable to either propoſition, it may yet be ſo reſtricted in the ſecond, by means of other words with which it is connected, as to create the neceſſary oppoſition of ſenſe. Example: چو صبح پرده دری می کنم شکایتها "When the morning draws the curtain of light, I utter my complaints;" ولی کنم بر آن کس که غمگسار من است "But I utter them to him only, who takes a ſhare in my ſorrows;" &c.

RULE

RULE FIFTH.

The opposition of sense between either proposition is not always expressed in terms, and must be inferred, in that case, by the understanding of the reader. Examples: دریغ آمدم تربیت ستوران "I thought it a pity to waste my instructions on brutes;" و آیینه داری در محلّهٔ کوران "And to hold up a mirror before the blind;" ولیکن در معنی باز بود "But the door of my subject was open;" و سلسلهٔ سخن دراز "And the chain of my reasoning was long;" that is to say, "It led me on;" &c. Supply the ellipsis: "I thought it a pity to waste my instructions on brutes, and was therefore disposed to be silent, but I spoke notwithstanding, because the door of my subject was open;" &c. بسیاری گفتم که دل با کسی نه پیوندم ولی "I often determined never to fall in love;" و دیدار خوبان اختیار از دست دانائی برد "But beauty is not to be resisted by the power of wisdom." Supply the ellipsis: "I had often determined never to fall in love, but my determination was of no avail, because the sight of beauty;" &c. &c. هرگزم در سر نبود اندیشهٔ عشق و لیک "The idea of falling in love never entered my mind;" پیل اگر در بند می افتد مسخّر می شود "But even an elephant must yield, if he be caught in the toils;" &c. Supply the ellipsis; "I had no thought of falling in love, but I fell in love notwithstanding;" &c. &c. I shall not venture to multiply, farther, the examples of this nature, which the reader will be able to form for himself at pleasure.

RULE SIXTH.

The word لیکن has been supposed, occasionally, to assume the character of a حرف استثنا or Particle of Exception;

TION; in which case, the following proposition forms an exception to that which precedes it. Examples: همه کس آمدند "They are all come;" ولیکن زید نیامد "But ZYDE is not come;" that is to say, "They are all come except ZYDE, who is not come;" فسانه همه را بشنود بسمع قبول "She listens with approbation to every body;" ولی بقصه من چون رسد بخواب شود "But she goes to sleep when it happens to be my turn to speak;" &c.

RULE SEVENTH.

THE word لیکن is supposed to be occasionally employed to indicate the relation of DETAIL; known in Grammar by the term تفصیل, and more commonly signified by the word اما. Example: همه کس دوستند در برو ولیکن دوست آن را دان "Every man is a friend before your face, but consider him only as a friend;" که یاد آرد ز تو چون دور ز کاری در میان افتد "Who thinks of you though absent for a long space of time." It seems to me *that the word* لیکن is here plainly employed to indicate the relation signified by the term استدراک; and I have therefore inserted this rule, merely with a view to express my own opinion of its fallacy. For an account of the relation signified by the term تفصیل or DETAIL, SEE PAGE 460 OF THIS VOLUME.

RULE EIGHTH.

THE word لیکن is employed, occasionally, in a sense nearly approaching to that of خصوص MORE ESPECIALLY; in which case, the proposition by which it is followed tends, not merely to confirm, but to add force and emphasis to the proposition comprised in the preceding sentence. Example: شاید

نشاید که خوبان به صحرا روند "It is unbecoming in beautiful women to walk into the fields;" همه کس شناسند و هر جا روند "To know every body, and to go every where;" خلاف است رفتن به صحرا ولیک "It is unſeemly in them to go into the fields;" نه انصاف باشد که بی ما روند "But it is quite intolerable that they ſhould go unaccompanied by us;" (their lovers;) &c.

RULE NINTH.

It is ſometimes employed, merely to corroborate the ſenſe of the preceding ſentence; and this happens, when the ſenſe of the ſentence by which it is followed, may be certainly inferred from that which precedes it. Example:—

زید اگر می آمد او را خرسند می کردم "If Zyde had come, I would have ſatisfied him;" ولیکن نیامد چه کنم "But he did not come, what then can I do?" It muſt be obvious to the reader, that the non-arrival of Zyde is completely aſcertained by the ſentence preceding the word لیکن; whence it follows that the ſentence following that word (لیکن نیامد) ſerves merely to confirm or corroborate the ſenſe of the firſt.

CONCLUSION.

Mr. Tooke ſtates that the Engliſh word but, antiently written bot, is the imperative of the Anglo Saxon verb botan, To boot; that is, "To ſuperadd; To ſupply; To ſubſtitute; To atone for; To compenſate with; To make amends with; To add ſomething more, in order to make up a deficiency in ſomething elſe." Among theſe various meanings of the word but, I prefer that of compensation or atonement; *firſt*, becauſe it ſeems to me that the idea of addition or of superadding is more accurately applicable to the ſenſe of the word and, than it is to the ſenſe of

 the

the word BUT; *secondly*, because that idea does not, in my opinion, account for the necessity of the OPPOSITION which I have stated to exist between two propositions connected together by the word BUT; and, *finally*, because that opposition is very well accounted for on the supposition that the word BUT indicates the relation of COMPENSATION OR ATONEMENT. Having premised these observations, which the reader will adopt or reject according to the dictates of his own judgment, I now proceed to offer a few general remarks on the nature of the OPPOSITION to which I have adverted.

THE most complete opposition of sense that can be imagined, is certainly that which exists between two attributes of a contrary nature: as RICHES and POVERTY; LIFE and DEATH; SICKNESS and HEALTH; VIRTUE and VICE; &c. Yet two propositions, comprising an attribute of either class, cannot, in the Persian Language, be accurately connected together by the word لیکن, which is generally at least, if not invariably, superceded in this case by the word بل. The phrase زید سخی است بلکه بخیل است "ZYDE is liberal, no, not liberal, but a miser;" is therefore perfectly accurate, according to the idiom of the Persian Language; and so, also, is the phrase زید سخی نیست بلکه بخیل است "ZYDE is not liberal but a miser;" for reasons obvious to those who have adverted to the true nature of the word بل. On the other hand, the phrase زید سخی است لیکن بخیل است "ZYDE is liberal but he is a miser," is plainly absurd: *first*, because both propositions are here effective with regard to ZYDE; and, *secondly*, because it follows that we ascribe to him two opposite and inconsistent attributes, which cannot both exist in his mind. And though the phrase زید سخی نیست لیکن بخیل است "ZYDE is not liberal but he is a miser," has not certainly any absurdity, the word لیکن is here

fiere inaccurate, and muſt be therefore ſuperceded by the word بل: *firſt*, becauſe the accuracy of two propoſitions connected together by the word لیکن depends on the OPPOSITION to which I have before adverted; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe that oppoſition has no exiſtence in the example before us; ſince the negation of LIBERALITY is generally equivalent to the preſence of AVARICE OR A MISERLY DISPOSITION, with which, therefore, it cannot be contraſted. But the word بل muſt yield, in its turn, to the word لیکن, in the phrase زید سخی نیست لیکن بخیل هم نیست "ZYDE is not liberal, but neither is he a miſer;" *firſt*, becauſe the middle point between liberality and avarice may be very fairly contraſted with either extreme, which juſtifies the uſe of the word لیکن; and, *ſecondly*, becauſe there is not here the relation ſignified by the term اضراب, which is neceſſary to the accuracy of the word بل.

QUITTING thoſe attributes that are directly oppoſed to each other by ſenſe, we are now to conſider others in which the oppoſition conſiſts, merely, in a difference of ſenſe; and here it is important to obſerve that the GOOD OR AGREEABLE qualities of every object are oppoſed to thoſe which are BAD or DISAGREEABLE; and this kind of oppoſition is generally, perhaps indiſpenſibly neceſſary to the accuracy of two propoſitions connected together by the word لیکن; or, in our Language, by the word BUT. Accordingly, we ſay of a man that "He is courageous but not generous; rich but not liberal;" &c. or of a woman that "She has great beauty but very little ſenſe;" &c. though BEAUTY is here an attribute of perſon, whereas SENSE OT INTELLIGENCE applies to her mind. And, on the contrary, we ſeldom or never ſay of a man that "He is cowardly but not liberal; poor but not generous;" &c. or of a woman that "ſhe is very ugly but a very great fool;" &c. becauſe UGLINESS and FOLLY are equally

equally disagreeable in their own nature; whence it happens that the mind will not recognise between them, that opposition which is necessary to constitute the accuracy of two propositions connected together by the word But.

But if, as it very often happens, we are led by any accidental association of ideas to form an expectation that beauty and folly will be found together; and that sense is likely to accompany in women the absence of grace or personal charms, we may then say of a woman that "she is very handsome but exceedingly sensible; or very ugly *but remarkably foolish*;" &c. because the association to which I have here adverted, immediately *creates* that opposition between the attributes in question, which is necessary to constitute the accuracy of two propositions connected together by the word But.

Yet still, it must be admitted that the most natural association of ideas is that by which the good or agreeable qualities of every object are opposed to those which are bad or disagreeable; and it happens accordingly, in our Language, that the word and (*not* But) *is commonly employed to establish the connexion between two attributes of the same class*; and that and is generally superceded by but, in the case of two attributes opposed to each other in the manner to which I have now adverted. Examples: "She is very handsome and very agreeable;" "She is very handsome but not agreeable." She is very ugly and very disagreeable;" "She is very ugly but not disagreeable;" &c. And the violation of this natural association of ideas, though it may be sometimes observed to occur in the Language, according to the principle explained in the preceding paragraph, is commonly marked in express terms: as for Example: "She is very ugly, but with all her uglinefs, a very great fool; &c." where the phrase "with all her uglinefs," or "notwithstanding her uglinefs," is clearly employed to indicate an opinion that

that UGLINESS is generally the concomitant of WISDOM, and by a necessary consequence opposed to FOLLY.

BUT if the SUBJECT of two propositions connected together by the word BUT, shall not be the same, the attributes may then be of the same class, or otherwise, according to the option of every speaker; *first*, because we may oppose the good or bad qualities of one object to those of another; as "ZYDE is learned but AMR is virtuous;" "ZYDE is ignorant but AMR is vicious;" &c. and *secondly*, because we may oppose the GOOD qualities of one object to those which are BAD or DISAGREEABLE in another; as "ZYDE is learned but AMR is ignorant," and other examples of the same nature.

THE preceding observations are intended to illustrate some of the principles on which the practical application of the word لكن, or of BUT occurring in the sense of لكن, seems to depend; but the word BUT is employed for many various purposes of Speech; and must, therefore, be variously translated by the words اما; لكن; بل; &c. according to the examples in which it is found to occur. Thus, it occurs twice in the following example: *first*, in the sense of لكن, to denote the relation signified by the term استدراك; and, *secondly*, in the sense of بل, to denote the relation signified by the term اضراب. "You pray, but (لكن) it is not that GOD would convert you to the true religion; but (بل) that he would confirm you in your own." And it occurs, I think in the sense of اما, at the beginning of HORACE's Ode on the witch CANIDIA, (At, ô Deorum, quicquid in cœlo regit &c.) as translated into English by DOCTOR FRANCIS.

But Oh, ye Gods, whose awful sway
Heaven, earth, and human kind obey,
What can this hideous noise intend?
On me, what ghastly looks they bend! &c.

I venture to believe, though I can offer no demonstrative proof of the fact, that the word BUT, and the Latin AT, are here employed, like the word إِنَّ, to add force and efficacy to the following proposition; ("I pray you, Oh ye GODS, what is the meaning of this hideous noise?" &c.) and, in that case, there is at least one sense of the word BUT, which is not accounted for by MR. TOOKE's etymology. But if we admit the accuracy of that etymology, it is still, in my opinion, the merest mockery to say that there is nothing more to be done on the subject; for the practical application of the word BUT unquestionably admits of the most useful illustrations, utterly independent of all etymology, and of a nature more satisfactory than that recondite science has ever yet been able to furnish. (SEE MR. LOCKE's opinion on the subject, as quoted in the DIVERSIONS OF PURLEY, VOLUME FIRST, PAGE 190; and if you have any *turn for Grammatical research*, reject his examples and substitute others wherever you please, but adopt his principle which is certainly accurate, and will guide you to the truth, notwithstanding MR. TOOKE's opinion to the contrary.)

مان LIKE.

THIS is the contracted form of the participle مانند, derived from the verb مانستن TO RESEMBLE. It is added to the end of certain substantive nouns, in the sense of LIKE; as برو ای باد قاصدا و ببوس "Go, thou ZEPHYR, as my messenger, and kiss خاک درگاه آسمان مانش the dust of her threshold

threſhold which reſembles the heavens;" &c. The word آسمان itſelf, has been ſuppoſed, by ſome Etymologiſts, to be compounded of آس A MILLSTONE, and مان LIKE; becauſe the heavens revolve in the manner of a millſtone. The word مان has other ſenſes, for which the reader is referred to the Dictionary.

مانا LIKE.

THIS word is derived from the former by adding الف; and is, in truth, a صفت مشبه, or ſimple adjective noun, having the ſenſe of LIKE. Ex: بدرانی صف اعدا بدان تیغ فلک مانا "You break the ranks of your enemies with that ſword which reſembles the heavens." The word مانا is alſo very commonly employed as a کلمهٔ تاکید, or WORD OF CORROBORATION; and in that character, is generally tranſlated by the word CERTAINLY. Example: آنکس که مرا بکشت باز آمد پیش "Having put me to death, ſhe has come to viſit me;" مانا که دلش بسوخت بر کشتهٔ خویش "Surely her heart is touched with compaſſion for her victim!" It is plain, however, that the word مانا, in this and other ſimilar examples, might be accurately tranſlated by the word "Apparently;" and does not therefore ſuffer any real fluctuation of ſenſe. It forms a component part of the word همانا, which is of common occurrence in the Language, and will be duly conſidered in its proper place.

مر

As a particle, this word has no ſenſe, or at leaſt none that I am acquainted with. It is often prefixed to words followed by the termination را; and ſeems, in that caſe, to be a mere pleonaſm: as مر اورا گفتم "I ſaid to him;" &c. It has been

ſuppoſed

supposed by some writers to occur occasionally in the sense of حصر RESTRICTION. Example: "مر او را است کبریا و منی" To him alone (the DEITY) belongs almighty greatness and self-sufficiency;" that is to say, "the most entire independence on all other beings;" &c. The word "alone" is here introduced for the purpose of conveying to the reader an accurate idea of the meaning imputed to the word مر when it occurs in the sense of حصر RESTRICTION; but though the attributes here imputed to the DEITY, are certainly applicable to him alone, I am of opinion that this restriction, in the example before us, is rather inferred on principles of reason, than positively expressed by the word مر. In all the examples which have occurred to my observation of the practical application of the word مر, it is followed by a noun which is followed by را: as مر او را است گواهی و باسه; &c. but the Persian Grammarians seem to believe that its accuracy has no dependence on the use of را, and in this opinion they are probably right.

مگر EXCEPT; PERHAPS; &c.

THOSE who believe that اگر IF, is a corruption of the verb گیر TAKE, will be disposed, I imagine, to consider مگر as a corruption of the verb مگیر DO NOT TAKE, in the Prohibitive form. Be that as it may, the word مگر is generally considered as a حرف استثنا or PARTICLE OF EXCEPTION; and, in that character, it is commonly employed to form, *first*, the استثنای متصل or PROPER EXCEPTION; and, *secondly*, the استثنای منقطع or IMPROPER EXCEPTION.

THE PROPER EXCEPTION is that in which the مستثنی, or THING EXCEPTED, is known to have been originally comprised in the sense of the مستثنی منه from which it is excepted:

cepted: as همه کس آمدند مگر زید "They are all come but Zyde;" where the words همه کس form the مستثنی منه, as opposed to زید who is the مستثنا, properly excepted by means of the word مگر; because the phrase همه کس آمدند would have been otherwise understood as applicable to Zyde among others. It follows from the nature of the مستثنا, that the مستثنا منه must be applicable to a PLURALITY of objects; which may be obtained, *first*, by the use of numerals, or of the plural number: as علمای شهر همه رسیدند مگر زید "The learned men of the city are all come but Zyde;" *secondly*, by the use of a collective noun: as کاروان همه رسیدند مگر زید "The caravan are all arrived but Zyde;" and, *finally*, by the use of a negative applicable to a noun in the singular number: as کس نیامد مگر زید "Nobody is come but Zyde;" because the phrase "No body is come;" or "Not any body is come," is equivalent to an affirmation of the absence of every body. The مستثنا منه which is expressed in the preceding examples, may be accurately understood in many others: as نزد من نیامد مگر زید "No body came to me but Zyde;" or to furnish the authority of Saadee: اگر گنج قارون بدست آوری "Though you possess yourself of the treasures of Kauroon," نماند مگر آنچه بخشی بری "They will not remain; but what you bestow (in charity, &c.) that you will carry with you" (to the next world.) Or to express the same sentiment in other words: "No part of your treasures will avail you in the next world, but that part which is here devoted to charitable uses."

The preceding observations are applicable to the استثنای متصل or Proper exception; to which the

استثنای منقطع or Improper exception is directly opposed. The latter, therefore, extends to all those examples in which the مستثنی is known not be included in the مستثنی منه : as جماعت مدرسه آمدند مگر زید. "The people of the College are all arrived but Zyde;" when it so happens that Zyde, though expected in the College, is known not to be a member of that institution. So also in the following Example: چهار صد حکم انداز خطا کردند "Four hundred accomplished archers missed the mark; مگر کودکی except a child, که بر بام رباطی who on the top of a building, به بازیچه تیر از هر طرف می انداخت was shooting arrows for his amusement in every direction: باد صبا The morning breeze تیر او را در حلقهٔ انگشتری بگذرانید carried his arrow straight through the ring;" &c. Since it must be obvious to the reader, that the child is here improperly excepted from the four hundred archers, because he did not originally constitute one of their number. Such improper exceptions are of common occurrence *in the Persian* Language, but not perhaps in every other Tongue.

I will not undertake to affirm that the word مگر has any real fluctuations of sense, but the practical application of that word to the purposes of Speech, demands the illustrations comprised in the following rules.

RULE FIRST.

The word مگر is employed as a حرف استثنا or Particle of Exception, in the manner stated in the preceding observations. Example: امید بندهٔ مسکین بهیچ واثق نیست "The hopes of this poor and forlorn mortal depend on nothing;"

nothing;" مگر بلطف خداوندگار بخشنده نواز " Except on the bounty of God, the general benefactor of all his creatures." This is an example of the Proper Exception. علاج درد مشتاقان طبیب عام نشناسد " Ordinary physicians know not how to cure the pangs inflicted by Love on his votaries;" مگر لیلی کند درمان غم مجنون شیدا را "Except Lylee, who alone knows how to cure the woes of the love-lorn Mujnoon." This is intended as an example of the Improper Exception, but its true nature perhaps admits of some discussion.

RULE SECOND.

The word مگر is commonly employed to denote the relation of Doubtful Expectation, known by the terms ترقب و انتظار. In this case, it is generally translated by the word perhaps; and the examples of its occurrence are generally divided into those which indicate, *first* ترجی or hope; as ایشان را مگر نصیحتی کنی و موعظتی گوئی. " Perhaps you will admonish (or I hope you will admonish) these people;" &c. *secondly*, اشفاق or fear: as از من جدا می شوی مگر مرا فراموش کنی " You are going to leave me, perhaps you will forget me; or I fear you will forget me;" &c. and, *finally*, شک و ظن doubt or suspicion: as مگرش خدمت دیرین من از یاد برفت " Perhaps she has forgotten my ancient services;" a sentiment, however, which implies fear; though other examples might no doubt be found, in which there is no mixture either of hope or fear.

RULE THIRD.

All the remaining examples of the practical application of the word مگر may be referred, I imagine, to one or other of the senses detailed in the preceding rules; and it is possible, even, that one of those senses may be referred to the other; in which case, the word مگر has no real fluctuations of sense. Be that as it may, I proceed to state that the word مگر is supposed to denote, occasionally, the relation of CAUSATION; known in Grammar by the term تعلیل; or more properly, in my opinion, it denotes that particular species of CAUSATION which is known by the terms غایت و غرض, and more commonly signified by the particle تا. Example: حلال است ازو نقل کردن خبر "It is lawful to disclose his designs; (the designs of a tyrant;) مگر خلق باشند ازو بر حذر that mankind may be on their guard against him."

RULE FOURTH.

It is occasionally employed to denote the relation signified by the term اضراب; and more commonly expressed by the word بل. Example: ندیدم کسی سرگران از شراب "I saw no man intoxicated with wine;" مگر هم خرابات دیدم خراب. "Nay, I even saw the tavern deserted." It may be also annexed to an INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE; in which case it is generally understood to have itself an Interrogative sense like the particle آیا. Example: خواب است مگر کی می نماید "Is this a dream which appears to me?" یا عشوه همی دهد خیالم "Or does my imagination deceive me?" &c. There is no doubt of the interrogative character of this sentence, but the word مگر might certainly be translated by the word PERHAPS.

RULE FIFTH.

It is ſuppoſed to be occaſionally employed to indicate the relation of DISCOVERY; known in Grammar by the term استدراک, and more commonly ſignified by the word لیکن. Example: "شنیدم که از نیک مردی فقیر" "I have heard that againſt a pious Durveiſh," "دل آزرده شد پادشاهی کبیر" "A powerful monarch conceived reſentment;" "مگر بر زبانش حقی رفته بود" "But the Durveiſh had merely ſpoken the truth;" "ز گردن کشی بر وی آشفته بود" "And the offence taken by the king was founded on the haughtineſs of his own character." I am clearly of opinion that the word مگر cannot be accurately tranſlated, in this example, by the word PERHAPS. "Perhaps the Durveiſh had told him ſome unpleaſant truth;" becauſe every man who underſtands the Perſian Language, will be of opinion, I believe, that the narrator (SAADEE,) does not here ſtate the fact as a mere gueſs of his own, but as a matter of certainty. I am not equally ſure that the word مگر is here employed in the ſenſe of لیکن, and will therefore leave the true meaning of that word, as it occurs in the example before us, to be determined by the judgment of every reader.

RULE SIXTH.

It is ſuppoſed to be occaſionally employed in the ſenſe of the conjunctive AND. Example: سه صد و شصت بند فاخر دانستی "He underſtood three hundred and ſixty rules;" (for wreſtling,) و هر روز از ان بنوعی کشتی گرفتی "And uſed a new one every day;" مگر گوشهٔ خاطرش با جمال یکی از شاگردان میلی داشت "But he conceived an affection for one of his pupils;" سه صد و پنجاه و نه بندش در آموخت "And taught him

three hundred and fifty-nine rules;" &c. I have here translated the word مگر by the word BUT; yet it does not seem to denote the relation signified by the term استدراک, since the first proposition does not, apparently, give birth to a doubt which is removed by the second. Whether *it* has or has not the sense of the conjunctive AND, I leave to be determined by the judgment of the reader.

RULE SEVENTH.

IT is supposed to be occasionally employed after تا, as a کلمهٔ تاکید, or WORD OF CORROBORATION; but the examples adduced in proof of that opinion, are utterly unsatisfactory in my estimation. Example: تا مگر یک نفسم بوی تو آرد دم صبح "In order that the morning breeze might waft to me a gale charged with fragrance from thee;" همه شب منتظر مرغ سحرخوان بودم "I watched all night to hear the crowing of the early cock;" &c. It is plain, I think, that the word مگر might be here translated by the word PERHAPS; in which case, it is not employed as a کلمهٔ تاکید, to corroborate the sense of the particle تا.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE nothing more to observe on the nature and application of the word مگر to the purposes of Speech; and am not much satisfied with the accuracy of the ideas which, in the absence of better information, I have yet thought it right to throw out on the subject. The examples furnished by me, constitute the facts, with reference to which, our opinion of the true meaning of the word مگر must be ultimately formed; but whether I have mistaken its meaning in any one or more of these examples, or whether it has, or has not any real *fluc-*

tuations

tuations of ſenſe, theſe are queſtions of theory, which are to be determined by the judgment of every reader. I now proceed to conſider the nature and application of the word مه.

مه

The word مَه is a negative correſponding with مَه, from which it has been formed in all probability, ſince the letters ميم and نون are often convertible together in the Language: as بَرگُستُم or بَرگُستين "The armour of a man or a horſe;" &c. Example: بر راه امام خود بپّا رود "He imitates the conduct of his own Imaum;" اور امشناس و مه امامش را "But do you have no confidence, either in him, or in his Imaum." Theſe lines are tranſlated by gueſs, ſince I know nothing of the context with which they are connected. So, alſo, in the following example: مه آن و مه این which occurs in the ſenſe of نه آن ماند و نه این "Neither does this remain nor does that;" &c. Except in the ſecond perſons ſingular and plural of the Prohibitive mode of a Perſian verb, the word مَه is generally ſuperceded in the Language by نه.

نا

This word, prefixed to an adjective noun or an epithet, is employed to indicate the relation of NEGATION: as ناخردمند Unwise; نامسموع Unheard; نایاب Not to be found; ناکس Unworthy; &c. &c. It is rarely prefixed to ſubſtantive nouns, though ſome examples of that kind are not wanting in the Language: as ناهموار Uneven; ناتدبیر Unthinking; or "Having no reſource;" &c. It is oppoſed in point of ſenſe to the word بی Without, which is employed to indicate the relation of PRIVATION.

This is the letter نون, the nature of which has already been explained in page 411 et seq. of this volume. In poetry, it is ſometimes pronounced with ياي مظهر, like the word زن, to which it rhymes in the poem from which I have extracted the following example: زبان را ازان رخصت نه بده "Permit your tongue to prohibit that;" &c.

نی

This is another negative, *ſynonimous* with نه; and there is nothing to be obſerved on the ſubject of its application to the purpoſes of ſpeech. The following is an example of its occurrence in the Language: نی تاب وصل دارم نی طاقت جدائی "Neither can I bear your preſence, nor ſuffer your abſence." Some writers believe the letter نون of the word نی to be moveable by the vowel *Futha*, and others give the preference to the vowel *Kuſra*, in which caſe the letter *Ya* aſſumes the ſound of *Ya Mujhool*. It may be inferred from a Commentary of Jaumee on the opening of the Musnovee of Molovee Room, that he gave the preference to the vowel *Futha*; but his obſervations on the ſubject would occupy more ſpace than can be reaſonably aſſigned to ſuch a diſcuſſion.

نیز Also.

This word is indifferently employed, *firſt*, to indicate "the participation of two nouns in the ſame action:" as زید آمد و بکر نیز "Zyde is come and ſo alſo is Bukr;" *ſecondly*, to indicate "the participation of two actions in the ſame noun:" as زید بر بکر خشم گرفت و نیز دشنامش داد "Zyde became angry with Bukr, and alſo abuſed him;" or, *finally*, to

to indicate "the participation of two actions in the same inference:" as زید نیامد و بکر نیز رفت "Zyde is not come, and Bukr also is gone;" where the absence both of Zyde and Bukr, is obviously inferred from either of the verbs with which they are here connected.

It follows from the preceding observations, that the word نیز invariably requires two sentences, both of which may be expressed in terms: as دل رفت و سینه نیز تهی شد ز جان کنون "My heart is gone, and my bosom, also, is now alas! emptied of my soul," ای صبر باز گرد که این جا نه جای تست "Leave me therefore, O patience! for here is no residence for you;" &c. Or one of them may be accurately omitted in speech, provided the context be of such a nature as to enable the reader to supply the omission. Example: چندان در مهر آن خورشید خو کردم به تنهائی "Devoted to the love of my mistress who resembles the sun, I am so accustomed to solitude;"

که گر دستم دهد از سایهٔ خود نیز بگریزم "That were it possible, I would fly even (literally, also,) from my own shadow." Supply the ellipsis: "As I fly from others, so also would I fly from my own shadow;" &c. Of the repetition of نیز in either proposition, the following example may be adduced: نه زو ایمن اینان که هستند نیز "Neither do those who live escape the shafts of woe;"

نه آنان که رفتند رستند نیز "Nor have those escaped them who are already dead." (The Poet, I conceive, means that "The dead have not yet escaped, since the great day of judgment is still before them.") The same sentiment is expressed more clearly and forcibly, in the following couplet, from the Hindoostanee Poet Souda:

یهان فکر معیشت هی وهان وعدهٔ حشر "Here, (in this world,)

are the cares of life; and there, (in the next world,) are the terrors of judgment;" آسودگی حسرتی ست نه یهان بی نه و هان بی "Tranquillity is therefore nothing but a name, and is equally unattainable here and hereafter."

The words نیز and هم are sometimes employed as synonimous terms; and in that case, the one may follow the other, in order to corroborate or enforce its meaning. Example: اعتمادی نیست بر کار جهان "There is no dependence on the affairs of this world;" بلکه بر گردون گردان نیز هم "Nay, nor even on the revolving Heavens." The word نیز has no real fluctuations of sense, though the Persian Grammarians (erroneously I think,) have assigned to it the sense of the preposition با in the example جواب بر خدمتی نیز هم "Carry with you my answer and also my services;" &c.

وا

This word occurs in the sense of با With, of which it is probably another form; as جواو is another form of جواب; آو of آب; &c. Example: وا او گفتم for با او گفتم "I said to him;" or "spoke with him;" &c. It is also supposed to occur occasionally in the sense of the particle به: as گرچه ما و اسوی ما وای رویم "Although we are going to a place of refuge." (. ما بسوی ماوای رویم) Prefixed to a Persian Infinitive, it is sometimes significant: as واکردن در "To open the door;" and sometimes a pleonasm: as وارسیدن "To arrive;" وارستن "To escape;" &c.

وار

As a termination, this word has the sense of Like: as خواجه وار "Like a master;" بنده وار "Like a servant;" غلام وار.

قلم وار "Like a pen;" همّوار "Like each other;" or "Even;" &c. Example: بادا ز کفم انگشت قلم وار شکسته "May my fingers be cut from my hand like a pen." It seems also to possess, occasionally, the sense of the word صاحب as هشیوار "A man of understanding;" or "A wise man;" دیده وار "A sentinel;" &c.

وان

As a termination, this word generally signifies A PROTECTOR; GUARDIAN; &c. as گله وان "A keeper of sheep;" دشت وان "One who takes care of the fields;" ساروان "The groom of a camel;" &c. It is entirely synonimous with بان, from which it is formed in all probability, by the usual conversion of با into وا. The word بان is, however, more commonly used in the Language than وان: as دربان "A door keeper;" &c. And though both are now employed as terminations, they may have been originally self significant words.

وش

As a termination, this word is commonly employed, like the word فش, in the sense of LIKE: as ماه وش "Like the moon;" خور وش "Like the sun;" &c. And it is probable that they are both varieties of the same word, though وش occurs in the Language more commonly than فش. Example: پشنگ شنگ و قدرخان قدر و دارا رای آرش فش "Having the grace of PISHUNG; the dignity of KUDUR KHAN; the wisdom of DARIUS; the skill (in archery) of the celebrated AURUSH;" سیاوش وش مؤیّد ید تهمتن تن مظفّر فر "In glory equal to SEEAWUSH; in rank equal to MOOZUFFUR; having a body strong as that of ROOSTŬM; and a hand favored by Divine Providence;" &c.

و

وه STRANGE! &c.

THE word وه is always an INTERJECTION, and has not, perhaps, any real fluctuations of sense. Its practical application to the purposes of speech is nevertheless susceptible, in my opinion, of some illustrations; and these I proceed to furnish accordingly, in the form of detached and general rules.

RULE FIRST.

IT is commonly employed *to indicate* SURPRISE OR ASTONISHMENT: in which case, it is generally followed by an Interrogative sentence significant of the cause of such astonishment, whether accompanied by sensations of a painful or a pleasurable nature. Examples: وه چه صیادی که هر صیدی که از زخم تو یافت "Heavens what an admirable huntress are you! whose wounded victim سر بدنبال تو دارد تا بود جان در تنش continues to pursue you during the rest of his life." It is proper to observe that the word از here denotes the relation specified in RULE FIRST, PAGE 435 OF THIS VOLUME: whence it follows that the word زخم, in the first line, has in reality *the sense of the* Plural number: "Every victim which has received *of* your wounds;" &c. The Poet's mistress is obviously the huntress of whom he speaks on the present occasion, and the wounds inflicted, are those of Love. The sentiment excited, is that of ADMIRATION, which is converted into CENSURE, in the following example: پدر و مادر و فرزند و عزیزان رفتند "Our parents and children and all whom we love are gone!" وه چه غافل و مستیم و چه کوته نظریم "Heavens! then, how negligent, unreflecting and short sighted are we!"

RULE

RULE SECOND.

It is ſometimes followed by a ſentence ſignificant of a propoſition, the occurrence of which we deſire to prevent; and has been ſuppoſed, in this caſe, to denote an idea nearly ſynonimous with that ſignified by the word حاش Let it never be. Example: وه که دارا کشی چرا گیرد بخون چون منی "Heavens! Why ſhould they puniſh her for the death of ſuch a creature as I am?" &c. It is plain, however, that the word چرا is here rhetorically employed to form the استفهام انکاری as explained in page 114 of this volume; and the word وه has not, therefore, any real fluctuation of ſenſe. The nominative to the word گیرد is indefinite: "Why ſhould any one puniſh her;" &c.

RULE THIRD.

It is ſometimes followed by a ſentence ſignificant of our hopes or wishes; and has been ſuppoſed, in that caſe, to indicate the idea ſignified by the terms تمنی و ترجی: though in point of fact *it has not, I believe,* any real fluctuation of ſenſe. Examples: تا رسیدی بمن آواز سپاه تو گهی "In order that I might ſometimes obtain intelligence of you;" وه چه بودی که سر راه تو بودی وطنم "Would that my abode (or, literally, "Heavens! how delightful if my abode) were on the road that leads to your habitation." نامش برزبانم وه چه خوش باشد اگر "I am always uttering her name, would that ſhe نام من هم برزبانش گاه گاهی بگذرد would ſometimes condeſcend to utter mine;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It is ſometimes followed by a ſentence ſignificant of an event which is the ſubject of grief, lamentation or regret; and

and muſt be generally tranſlated, in this caſe, by the word ALAS! Example: شاد بودم بر امید آنکه یارم می کشد "I was pleaſed in the hope that I might die by the hand of my miſtreſs;" (by the influence of her preſence) وه که هجران پیش دستی کرده زارم می کشد "But ALAS! abſence from her is undermining my life."

RULE FIFTH.

It is ſometimes followed by a ſentence ſignificant of an evil already paſt, and therefore a ſubject of JOY and GRATULATION. Example: آمدی وه که چه مشتاق و پریشان بودم "You are come! Heavens how impatient, how ſorrowful was I;" تا برفتی ز برم صورت بی جان بودم "Since you left me, I have been merely the lifeleſs image of a man." It is alſo ſuppoſed to be employed occaſionally in the ſenſe of زنهار Ho! HAVE A CARE! Example: چند بسناز رفتنت وه که مبادا ناگهان "How long will your cruelty incite you to leave me? Have a care leſt it happen (which Heaven forbid) شعله بدامنت زند نالهٔ صبح گاهیم that my ſighs in the morning may ſet fire to your garment;" that *is to ſay*, "call down on your head the diſpleaſure of heaven."

CONCLUSION.

ADMITTING that the word وه has no real fluctuations of ſenſe, I hope the reader will not, at this period of his progreſs, require an explanation of the motives which have induced me to offer the preceding obſervations on its practical uſe. For the practical uſe of the word وه, like that of other words, depends, not merely on the ſenſe which it was formed to denote, but alſo on the idiom of the Language to which it belongs; and if the obſervations detailed in the preceding rules, have any tendency to illuſtrate the influence of Perſian idiom,

idiom, as applicable to the practicle application of that word, it is plain that they need no farther defence. With these remarks, I leave my readers to the exercise of their own judgment on the question that relates to the propriety or otherwise of inserting those rules; to which, to say the truth, I myself attach no very considerable degree of importance.

ها

THIS word, in its common application, is generally supposed to be nearly synonimous with اینک; a diminutive formed from the demonstrative این, and commonly emyloyed in the sense of BEHOLD! I am of opinion, however, that the word ها has in it something of the character of a کلمهٔ تنبیه or WORD OF ADMONITION; whereas اینک is merely a DEMONSTRATIVE NOUN. Example: کعبه چه کنی با حجر الاسود و زمزم "What should you make of the KABA, (or temple of MECCA,) its black stone, and the well ZUMZUM; ها عارض و زلف و خط ترکان ختایی "Behold, rather, the face and the locks and the features of your beloved;" &c. There is an Arabic word ها, which is commonly employed as a کلمهٔ تنبیه or WORD OF ADMONITION; and also in the sense of the verb خذ TAKE. It is possible, therefore, that the Persian ها, which is of rare occurrence in the Language, may have been derived from that source.

هان

THIS is a کلمهٔ تنبیه or WORD OF ADMONITION; and may be generally, perhaps invariably, translated by the words HO! HAVE A CARE! Its effect is to add force and emphasis to every proposition by which it is followed: as هان مشو نومید چون واقف نهٔ از سر غیب "Have a care! do not despair, since you know nothing of the secrets of fortune;"

tune;" &c. and it is ſometimes repeated by way of HYPERBOLE: as باش و باش او را مجو در گلستان "Have a care! do not look for him in the garden." In the following example, it is ſuppoſed to have a ſenſe nearly approaching to that of آری TRULY: نه پندارمت مال مردم خوری "I do not ſuppoſe that you make away with the property of other men;" چه پیش آمدت تا بزندان دری "What then has happened that I find you in jail!" بگفت آری ای مبارک نفس "To this, he replied, truly my good friend," نخوردم بحیلت گری مال کس "I have not obtained by treachery the property of any body;" &c.

هرآینه CERTAINLY.

This word is probably compounded of هر EVERY, and آینه, formed from آیین, which ſignifies روش; that is to ſay, MODE; MANNER; &c. It is employed to corroborate the ſenſe of every ſentence to which it is annexed: as هرآینه زید نیک است "Certainly ZYDE is good or virtuous;" and is ſometimes contracted in poetry into هراینه or باینه. Its nature and character is too obvious to admit of illuſtration by the rules of Grammar.

هرگز.

THIS word ſeems properly to ſignify "Every time;" or "All times;" whence the adjective هرگزی ETERNAL. Example: هرچه او برود هرگزی نباشد "That which paſſes is not eternal;" او هرگزی و باقی روان است "GOD is eternal, and every thing is tranſitory but him alone." The word هرگز ſhould be compounded, apparently, of هر EVERY, and

ſome

ſome other word; but I know of no ſuch word as گر in the Language, and cannot, therefore, explain its etymology. It is employed to corroborate the ſenſe of a negative ſentence; and, in combination with the negative, is conſtantly tranſlated by the word NEVER. Example: بجان آمدم از قید هستی کاشکی هرگز "My ſoul is ſick of the bonds of exiſtence;" نهادی گذر بر محنت آباد جهان مارا "Would that I had never entered this habitation of woe!" &c. It may accurately coaleſce with an Interrogative ſentence, of the nature ſignified by the term استفهام انکاری: as هرگز دیدی دست عاصی بر کتف بسته "Did you ever ſee the hands of crime (here uſed for criminal,) bound to its ſhoulders? الا بعلت درویشی unleſs the firſt cauſe of it were poverty!" And the reaſon is obvious: *namely*, becauſe the استفهام انکاری implies a negative, ſince the ſenſe of the ſentence might be thus expreſſed: "You NEVER ſaw a crime committed that was not originally occaſioned by poverty;" &c. The exiſtence of a negative, whether expreſſed or implied, is therefore neceſſary to the accuracy of the application of the word هرگز, which is never found to coaleſce with any affirmative ſentence whatever. It is indifferently applicable to all the tenſes of a Perſian verb; and, with the exception of its reſtriction to the negative and prohibitive forms, has nothing in its nature to require explanation.

هلا Ho!

THIS is probably another form of the word ای, ſince the letters ه and همزه, are not unfrequently permuted together. Example: هلا تیغ و گرزها را بر کشید "Ho! Draw forth your ſwords and iron maces;" سپرهای چینی بسر در کشید "And cover

cover your heads with ſhields of China;" &c. There is nothing to be obſerved on its nature and application to the purpoſes of Speech.

هم

I AM of opinion that this word properly ſignifies مشارك A CO-PARTNER; or شريك يكديگر "Participating with each other, in the ſenſe of the following ſubſtantive noun," which is governed by it in the genetive caſe, though without the intervention of the vowel كسره: as همدرد "Participating in pain;" همراه "Participating in the road;" or "A fellow traveller;" همخانه "Participating in the ſame houſe;" or "A chum;" &c. Example: لاله همرنگ رخسار تو در گلزار نيست "There is not in the garden a tulip that rivals the color of your complexion;" &c. The examples of this claſs are very numerous, and may be formed by analogy, according to the pleaſure of every reader, with little regard to the authority of preſcription, which is not, however, to be entirely neglected.

BUT the word هم may be alſo employed in the ſenſe of يكديگر EACH OTHER; in which caſe, it ſeems to me that the idea ſignified by the word شريك has been rejected by that operation of the mind which is known in Grammar by the term تجريد, as already explained in PAGE 297 OF THIS VOLUME. In this caſe, the word هم may follow a prepoſition: as با هم "With each other;" از هم "From each other;" در هم "In each other;" بر هم "On each other;" &c. or it may precede or follow another noun by which it is governed in the genetive caſe: as شريك هم or همشريك "A co-partner;" سرهم, or همسر

همانند "Like each other;" انبازهم ; or همانباز " A co-partner;" &c. So, alfo, in the words همچون ; همچنین ; همواره ; &c. where the word هم neceffarily forms the firft component part of the terms, and cannot accurately occur as the fecond. In the fenfe of یکدیگر, the word هم is fometimes, though rarely, employed alone; but this never happens except in poetry: as زبس کردند هم را تیغ کاری در سر کویت " Much did they mortally wound each other in the ftreet inhabited by you;" &c. And generally fpeaking, it is compounded, in that fenfe, with a word fignificant of PARTNERSHIP, or fomething like it; as the reader will obferve on adverting to the meaning of moft of the examples adduced by me.

Now it is a general principle of the Language, that if two words occur together, one of which comprifes the whole fenfe of the other, and confequently renders the ufe of it fuperfluous, as in the cafe of صداع سر A HEADACHE, which is a combination of صداع A HEADACHE, and سر THE HEAD, the firft will fuffer that operation which is known in Grammar by the term تجرید; and thus the word صداع, in the preceding example, is fuppofed to fignify merely AN ACHE, not a HEADACHE, becaufe it is there followed by the word سر. And this principle will account for the ufe of هم, which properly fignifies شریک یکدیگر, in the fenfe merely of یکدیگر, whenever it is compounded with a word fignificant of partnerfhip, or fomething like it, as it happens in moft of the examples which I have adduced.

But the word هم, being fignificant of PARTNERSHIP or PARTICIPATION,

PARTICIPATION, is also very commonly employed in the sense of نیز Also; the nature of which has already been explained in PAGE 548 OF THIS VOLUME. And in this case, there are always two sentences either expressed or understood by the reader; as for example:

وصال چون بسر آمد فراق هم بسر آید "Since the period of enjoyment or intercourse with my beloved has passed away, I hope that of absence also may come to an end." Here, both sentences are fully expressed, and the word هم is given to the last; but it may yet be accurately given to both: as هم ترازو ترازو را راست کرد "The balance corrects the balance;" هم ترازو ترازو را کاست کرد "And the balance also shews the deficiency of the balance." In the case of the omission of one sentence, it must be supplied by the understanding of the reader: as ای دل از شام فراق و روز هجران غم مخور "Be not grieved, O my soul! at the period of absence from your beloved;" شام هجران هم رسد روزی بپایان غم مخور "For the night of separation will also, sooner or later come to an end;" that is to say, "As the days of enjoyment passed away, so, also, will the nights of separation come to an end."

THE word هم, followed by the demonstrative nouns, as همان and همین, seems to imply the sense signified by the term حصر RESTRICTION, as already explained. Example: بنده همان به که ز تقصیر خویش "He alone is a good servant of GOD, who on account of his sins, عذر بدرگاه خدا آورد offers up supplications at the throne of GOD;" &c. I think it possible, however, that the word هم is even here employed in the sense of نیز ALSO; in which case, there ought to be two Sentences, one of which not being expressed, must be supplied

plied by the underſtanding of the reader. But there is no ſecond ſentence which can be imagined in this example, and therefore the uſe of the word ثم implies, perhaps, a repetition of the firſt: "He is a good ſervant of God, and again he is a good ſervant of God, who offers his ſupplications at the throne of God;" &c. The effect of this repitition would be to convey an idea very ſimilar to that ſignified by the word حصر Restriction, as already explained.

مانا Certainly.

This is probably a contraction for همانا "Reſembling each other;" and is therefore ſynonimous with مانند, employed for همانند, in the following example from the Shah Nama: ز کار آزموده گزیده مهان "Among the number of experienced and choſen chiefs;" همانند تو نیست اندر جهان "There are none in the world who are equal to you." According to the etymological meaning of the word مانا, it ought, therefore, to be employed in the ſenſe of apparently; and there are doubtleſs many examples, in which it may be accurately tranſlated by that word. Generally ſpeaking, it ſeems to be employed, like the word هر آینه, in the ſenſe of certainly; and is therefore conſidered as a کلمهٔ تاکید or word of corroboration, though it has, in fact, no real fluctuations of ſenſe. Example:

نشاید ز آب و گل شکلی بدین خوبی و مطبوعی "Such an admirable form as that of my beloved, could never be created of duſt;"

مانا دست تقدیر از دل و جان کرده خمیر سرشش "Surely (or apparently) fate has made it of the matter of heart and ſpirit;" &c.

هو Ho!

This is a كلمهٔ تنبيه or Word of Admonition; and is of rare occurrence in the Persian Language. Example: هو مرد اهو دلاور جوان مرد اهو "Ho! you who are brave, you who are manly, Ho!" &c. There is nothing to be observed on its nature and application to the purposes of speech.

ي Ho!

This also is a كلمهٔ تنبيه or Word of Admonition, having the sense of Ho! as گفتم اين را دليل بايد گفت "I said to him, give me a proof of this?" گفت داني كه مي چه گوئي ي "And he replied, Ho! Do you know what you say?" As a substantive verb, in the sense of است is, we have the inflexions هستم I am, ي he is; and هستند sometimes contracted into هستند They are. I remember no example of هستم and have already furnished an example of ي in Page 307 of this volume. The following examples of هستند and هستند are extracted, the first from the Musnovee of Molovee Room; and the second from the Shah Nama of Firdousee. گفت يا رب كه ترا خاصان هستند "He said, O God! who are thy favorites?" كه مبارك طلعت وفرخ پي اند "For they are truly fortunate and happy." گشاده بر ايشان شده راز من "My secrets have been unfolded to them;" بهر نيك وبد هستند انباز من "And they participate with me in all my affairs."

هيچ Any.

There is little to be observed on the application of this word to the purposes of speech. It may be employed alone: as

as هیچ دیدی و هیچ دانی "Have you seen any thing?" or "Do you know any thing?" (of such an affair;) or it may be followed by a substantive noun: as بهیچ طعنه نخواهم جستن از تو فرار "No censures shall induce me to fly from thee." In this case, it has the effect of an indefinite article; and may be considered as superfluous when followed by a noun which is itself followed by an indefinite article: as هیچ کسی "Any person;" or "Any one person;" هیچ چیزی "Any thing;" or "Any one thing;" &c. In answer to a question, it is often translated by the word NOTHING: as بدو گفت کای دلبر پیچ پیچ "He said to his beloved, O my charmer;" ز یغما چه آوردهٔ گفت هیچ "What booty have you brought me? and she replied, Nothing." It is plain, however, that the negative هیچ نیاوردم "I have brought nothing," is understood in all the examples of this class.

هین Ho!

THIS word, which is spelt with YA MAAROOF, is a کلمهٔ تنبیه or WORD OF ADMONITION, having the sense of اژا Ho! HAVE A CARE! &c. Example: جان بابا گویدت ابلیس هین "The devil will address you in the language of flattery, Ho! then, Have a care! تا بدم نفریبدت دیو لعین lest that accursed DEMON should lead you astray." It may be repeated for the sake of HYPERBOLE: as هین و هین ای راه رو بیگاه شد "Have a care! you traveller, the time wears late;" آفتاب عمر سوی چاه شد "And the sun of your life descends to the well." From هین is formed هینا هین, which is sometimes employed as a substantive noun, having the sense of شتابزدگی OVER-HASTINESS. Example: رخنه کرد و تقسیم حال مرا "He made a hole

hole in the arrangement of my condition; در جستان داروگیرو هبابا هستین with all that authority and over-hastiness;" &c.

یا Or.

This word, according to its proper acceptation, is supposed to denote the relation of REPULSION, known in Grammar by the term ترديد. It has no real fluctuations of sense, and the following rules for its practical use have little importance in my estimation.

RULE FIRST.

It is employed in the case of شك or Doubt*; and this happens when the speaker means to imply, in his own mind, the existence of a DOUBT with regard to the accuracy of both or either of two propositions, connected together by the word یا. Example: زید آمد یا بکر "Is Zyde come, or is Bukr?" The answer may be that "Either is come;" that "Neither is come;" or that "Both are come." But if the speaker knows that one of them is come, and desires merely to ascertain which, the word یا *may still* be employed; and the question is then برای طلب تعیین. Example: آیا درین خانه زید است یا بکر "Is it Zyde who is in this house, or Bukr?" (since the speaker knows that one of them is certainly there.)

RULE SECOND.

It is employed to indicate the relation signified by the term ابهام; and this happens, when the speaker, having no doubt in his own mind, expresses himself in such a manner as may be supposed to create doubts in the mind of his hearer. Example: عارض است این یا قمر یا لاله حمر است این "Is this the face of my beloved, or is it a moon, or is it a crimson tulip?" &c.

RULE

RULE THIRD.

It may be employed to indicate the relation of DETAIL, known in Grammar by the term تفصیل ; and in this caſe, the ſpeaker has no doubts of his own, nor does he deſire to inſpire the reader with doubt. Example: کلمه اسم است یا فعل یا حرف "A word is either noun, verb, or particle." Or the relation ſignified by the term تخییر in which caſe, there is a CHOICE offered between two propoſitions, both of which cannot be adopted. Example: این زن را به نکاح خویش در آر یا خواهرش را "Marry this woman or her ſiſter." And if the adoption of both ſhall happen to be admiſſible, the relation is then known in Grammar by the term اباحت. Example: فقه بخوان یا علم بلاغت بیاموز "Study the LAW, or the ſcience of RHETORIC;" &c.

RULE FOURTH.

It is ſuppoſed to denote, occaſionally, the relation of EQUALITY, known in Grammar by the term مساوات. Example: من به ملاقات تو خواهم رفت تو آئی یا نیائی "Whether you come or not, I will go to viſit you." Or the relation known by the term اضراب and more commonly expreſſed by the word بل. Example: زید طبیب نیست "ZYDE is not a phyſician;" یا نحوی است یا منطقی "He is either a Grammarian or a Logician." Or the relation known by the terms غایت و غرض and more commonly ſignified by the particle تا. Example: دست از طلب ندارم "I will not quit the purſuit of my object; یا مرادم برآری یا وعدهٔ آن بمن نمائی "Until you comply with my wiſhes, or promiſe to do ſo." Or the relation of CONJUNC-

TION, which is commonly ſignified by the particle AND. Example: ریا یا خیانت هرگز مکن "Never practice fraud or hypocricy;" &c.

RULE FIFTH.

It is ſuppoſed to be occaſionally employed in a CONDITIONAL SENSE, like the particle اگر IF. Example:
این کار من بجای آرم "I will do this for you;"
یا حاجتم را بر آوری یا در ان باب سفارشی بنمائی "If you will grant my deſire, or if you will intercede in my favor for a given object;" &c. Or to form a حرف استثنا or PARTICLE OF EXCEPTION, like the word مگر: as
ترا محبوس خواهم ساخت "I will impriſon you;"
یا توبه کنی یا ضمان دهی "Unleſs you repent or provide ſecurity;" &c.

CONCLUSION.

I THINK it probable that the reader will criticiſe many of the preceding examples, ſome of which are perhaps inſufficient to eſtabliſh the principles which they are brought to illuſtrate. In fact, the practical uſe of the word یا OR, admits of little illuſtration by the rules of Grammar; and I ſhould have been diſpoſed to ſpare the reader's attention to the ſubject, had I not conſidered, *firſt*, that the Perſian word یا repreſents the united force of ſeveral Arabic particles diſtinguiſhed from each other in point of ſenſe, as اَوْ; اَمْ; and اَمَّا; and, *ſecondly*, that the preceding rules for its practical uſe, compriſing examples of its occurrence in the ſenſe of each of theſe three Arabic particles, may not, therefore, be wholly deſtitute of advantage to the learner.

یار

This word properly signifies Beloved, and is sometimes employed in the sense of a Lover. As a termination, it seems to be one of the حُرُوفِ نِسبی or Relative particles, described in Volume First, Page 439 of this Work. Examples: رَمْه‌یار "A shepherd; primitive رمه, "A flock;" دامیار "A huntsman;" primitive دام, "A net;" آبیار "A man employed to water the fields of the husbandman;" شَبیار "The name of a medicine taken at night;" &c. &c.

FINIS

NOTES

TO THE

SECOND VOLUME.

NOTES TO THE SECOND VOLUME.

NOTE FIRST.

PAGE 41.

I HAVE imputed to Mr. TOOKE, an intention to prove the following propofition; namely, that " all the particles of every Language, *muſt* have been originally verbs or nouns." By the uſe of the term MUST, I did not mean to aſcribe to Mr. TOOKE the abſurdity of denying the poſſibility of forming a Language on artificial principles, ſince it is plain that PSALMANAZAR, for example, might form the fictitious Language of FORMOSA on artificial principles; in which caſe, he would be likely enough to employ particles that were not originally verbs or nouns. All I meant to aſſert was merely this: that " the reſult of Mr. TOOKE's enquiries ſeems to have impreſſed on his mind, a very ſtrong conviction of the fact that all the particles of every Language may be traced to their origin as verbs or nouns." Still, the fact is not argued by Mr. TOOKE as a matter of neceſſary and immutable truth; for his arguments are all drawn from the hiſtory of Language, and as he reaſons from what is known to what is unknown, ſupporting his concluſions by the evidence of analogy, ſo it is plain that he could not hope to attain demonſtration, and has aimed only at the higheſt probability. I am ſorry therefore, to have employed the term MUST, which is certainly liable to miſapprehenſion; and ſhall be always ready, as ſoon as diſcovered, to rectify any

any miſtake or miſconception of his opinions that may have inadvertantly crept into my work.

NOTE SECOND.

PAGE 45.

IT has been ſaid that "Language is an art invented by artleſs men," and though the ſtructure of the Arabic Language evinces the moſt conſummate art and ſkill, I ſhall ſtill be called on, (if theſe diſquiſitions ſhould excite the attention of European reaſoners,) to explain how it is poſſible to concede to the firſt rude cultivators of Language, the art implied in the invention of primitive particles that were not originally verbs or nouns. The arguments againſt their invention are partly, I think, of a ſpeculative nature; and thoſe employed on the other ſide of the queſtion muſt alſo partake of the ſame character. For my part, I admit that the ſubject is full of difficulty, and as I cannot trace in my mind's eye, a ſatisfactory map of the origin and progreſs of human Speech, I venture, with the utmoſt diffidence, to offer the following opinions on the ſubject.

IF Speech were inſpired by the DEITY, there can be no difficulty with regard to the invention of primitive particles; and if, on other hand, Language be conſidered as of human origin, it follows of neceſſity that there was a period of time antecedent to that in which it was employed. The time, however, I preſume to be ſhort; becauſe I conceive that we are naturally ſpeaking, as well as reaſoning animals; by which I mean to ſtate my opinion that "no human ſociety could exiſt together for a week or a day, without conceiving ideas, and without an attempt to expreſs them to each other." Our tongues are our own, as much as our legs; and it ſeems to me equally unreaſonable to believe that we ſhould long refrain from the uſe of either. Every child utters a variety of

articulate

articulate ſounds, which yet belong to no Language on earth; and thoſe very ſounds acquire a ſignificant character in the nurſery, where they are well underſtood by the child and its nurſe. Theſe two teach each other the firſt rudiments of a rude Language, which is afterwards laid aſide by the child, for no reaſon in the world but one; namely, becauſe there is another Language, already eſtabliſhed, which is much better adapted to the purpoſes of Speech. Take away the eſtabliſhed Language, and the child would continue, during its future life, to deſignate WATER (for example,) by that arbitrary articulate ſound (as GUM) which it may have uttered by inſtinct in the nurſery, on the firſt preſentation of water to its view.

BUT if Language be inſtinctive to the human race, it is an abuſe of terms to call it an invention; and we might talk with as much propriety of the invention of walking, ſleeping, or eating, as we now do of the invention of Language. If there be any invention in the caſe at all, it muſt be therefore ſought for, in my opinion, not in the origin, but in the progreſſive improvement of human Speech; and the queſtion ſhould be decided, not ſo much by ſpeculative arguments, as by the weightier evidence of ſtubborn facts. There is invention, certainly, or to uſe a better term, there is obvious artifice, if not in the word علم KNOWLEDGE, at leaſt in the derivatives formed from that noun: ſuch as اعلام "Communicating knowledge or information;" استعلام "Aſking knowledge or information;" تعليم "Conveying inſtruction, or Teaching;" تعلّم "Receiving inſtruction, or Learning;" &c. And the artifice manifeſted in the formation of theſe few words, ſeems to me to indicate more ſkill in the firſt rude cultivators of Language, than would be neceſſary to the inflexion of a ſubſtantive noun by the ſimple ex-

pedient

pedient of artificial terminations: as PENNA; PENNÆ; PENNIS; PENNAS; &c.

I CANNOT, therefore, concede the point maintained by Mr. TOOKE and his followers, that "Language was invented by artleſs men;" for the whole ſtructure of the Arabic Language indicates the practical art or ſkill of the inventors, though utterly ignorant of the theory of Speech; and partial as I am to the Arab character, I cannot believe that they alone, among all mankind, had the wit to diſcover the utility of art, and the honor (excluſively) to apply it to the improvement of their own Language. On the contrary, I infer the uſe of art *in every other Language*, becauſe it muſt be *conceded* to this Language, and has never been baniſhed from other Tongues by any Grammarian, but Mr. TOOKE and his followers, who have by no means eſtabliſhed their point by ſuch evidence as a reflecting man can be reaſonably required or diſpoſed to admit as abſolutely concluſive on ſuch an occaſion. I ſay, therefore, that many TERMINATIONS in various Tongues have been formed, in all probability, on artificial principles; and if ſo, they cannot now be traced to their origin as nouns or verbs. And if the fact be admitted *in the caſes of* TERMINATIONS, it cannot, I think, be reaſonably denied in the caſe of PREPOSITIONS; which certainly perform the ſame functions, and are, to all intents and purpoſes, eſſentially the ſame in their nature and character. For it is merely accidental to our Language, that we prefix the prepoſition to the ſubſtantive noun, as TO LONDON; whereas, in other Languages, it follows the noun, as LONDON TO; or coaleſces with it in the form of a termination, as LONDON TO. The nature of the word TO cannot be affected by the occurrence of ſuch unimportant accidents as theſe; and whether we call it a prepoſition, a poſtpoſition, or a termination, is therefore a matter of no importance to its character, which remains unchanged under all the varieties of idiomatical uſage.

It ſeems to me, however, that Mr. Tooke and his followers have oppoſed to the invention of primitive particles, an imaginary difficulty which has no exiſtence in the nature of things. They deny the invention of thoſe particles, becauſe they cannot believe that ſavages ſat down at their leiſure, like ſo many Philoſophers, to invent prepoſitions, terminations, and conjunctions; a ſpecies of words repreſenting ideas not obvious to the ſenſes, nor eaſily intelligible, even at this day, without reference to the examples in which they occur. Now it is clear to me that the interſecting letter ya, in the word رَيْم, made its firſt appearance in the middle of that, or ſome other Arabic word; and though it has been ſince ſeparated from the radical رَم, with much advantage to the ſtudies of thoſe who ſit down to acquire the Language by rule, I hold the Grammarians entirely reſponſible for that ſeparation, which never, certainly, entered into the imagination of the rude inventor of the word رَيْم.

The terminations of our Language (if they were artificial,) muſt have been invented in the ſame manner; and thus the letter s of the plural number, made its firſt appearance at *the end* of a noun, as mountains; rivers; streams; &c. from which (in idea) it was never ſeparated, until Grammarians began to pull the Language to pieces. I hold the ſame creed with regard to the invention of prepoſitions and conjunctions; which aroſe naturally in the progreſs of Language, and made their firſt appearance in a ſtate of combination; or in other words, in the ſtructure of a ſentence. Conſidered in this point of view, I do not believe that there is more difficulty in the invention of a prepoſition, or a conjunction, than there is in the invention of many ſubſtantive nouns, repreſenting ideas of an abſtract nature, ſome of which are very nicely diſtinguiſhed from others by ſenſe: as emulation; envy; anger; and revenge; &c.

I cannot

I CANNOT conclude this note without expreffing my defire to know if the ANGLO-SAXONS had any particles? If they had none, the fact proves the accuracy of Mr. TOOKE's fyftem, confidered with reference to certain Tongues; and the ANGLO-SAXONS muft, in that cafe, be confidered as very clumfy artificers of Speech. If they had fewer than ourfelves, the fame imputation may be thought to apply in a certain degree; or at leaft, we fhall have better grounds than we have now, to determine the accuracy of that opinion by which it is maintained, that "Particles are not numerous in a rude Language." But if, as I fufpect, the Language of the ANGLO-SAXONS was not deficient in the number of its particles, it will then be matter of curious fpeculation to determine, "why thefe particles were not adopted by us, in preference to certain nouns and verbs, which we have adopted, apparently, for no other purpofes than that of reducing them afterwards to the rank of particles; a very unneceffary operation, if the ANGLO-SAXONS had particles ready manufactured to our hands."

NOTE THIRD.

PAGE 144.

I Copy the following Obfervations from the ELEMENTS OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE HUMAN MIND.

OF ABSTRACTION.

THE origin of appellatives, or, in other words, the origin of thofe claffes of objects which, in the fchools, are called *Genera*, and *Species*, has been confidered by fome Philofophers as one of the moft difficult problems in metaphyfics. The account of it which is given by Mr. SMITH, in his differtation on the origin of Languages, appears to me to be equally fimple and fatisfactory.

"THE affignation" (fays he) "of particular names, to de-

note particular objects; that is, the institution of nouns substantive; would probably be one of the first steps towards the formation of Language. The particular cave, whose covering sheltered the savage from the weather; the particular tree, whose fruit relieved his hunger; the particular fountain, whose water allayed his thirst; would first be denominated by the words, cave, tree, fountain; or by whatever other appellations he might think proper, in that primitive jargon, to mark them. Afterwards, when the more enlarged experience of this savage had led him to observe, and his necessary occasions obliged him to make mention of, other caves, and other trees, and other fountains; he would naturally bestow upon each of those new objects, the same name by which he had been accustomed to express the similar object he was first acquainted with. And thus, those words, which were originally the proper names of individuals, would each of them insensibly become the common name of a multitude."

"It is this application (he continues,) of the name of an individual to a great number of objects, whose resemblance naturally recalls the idea of that individual, and of the name which expresses it, that seems originally to have given occasion to the formation of those classes, and assortments, which, in the schools, are called *Genera* and *Species*; and of which the ingenious and eloquent Rousseau finds himself so much at a loss to account for the origin. What constitutes a species, is merely a number of objects; bearing a certain degree of resemblance to one another; and, on that account, denominated by a single appellation, which may be applied to express any one of them.

This view of the natural progress of the mind, in forming classifications of external objects, receives some illustration from a fact mentioned by Captain Cook in his account o[f a] small island called Wateeoo, which he visited in sailing

New Zealand to the Friendly Iſlands. " The inhabitants," ſays he, " were afraid to come near our cows and horſes, nor did they form the leaſt conception of their nature. But the ſheep and goats did not ſurpaſs the limits of their ideas; for they gave us to underſtand that they knew them to be birds." " It will appear," he adds, " rather incredible, that human ignorance could ever make ſo ſtrange a miſtake, there not being the moſt diſtant ſimilitude between a ſheep or goat, and any winged animal. But theſe people ſeemed to know nothing of the exiſtence of any other land animals, beſides hogs, dogs, and birds. Our ſheep and goats, they could ſee, were very different creatures from the two firſt, and therefore they inferred that they muſt belong to the latter claſs, in which they knew that there is a conſiderable variety of ſpecies." I would add to Cook's very judicious remarks, that the miſtake of theſe Iſlanders probably did not ariſe from their conſidering a ſheep or a goat as bearing a more ſtriking reſemblance to a bird, than to the two claſſes of quadrupeds with which they were acquainted; but to the want of a generic word, ſuch as quadruped, comprehending theſe two ſpecies; which men in their ſituation would no more be led to form, than a perſon who had only ſeen one individual of each ſpecies, would think of an appellative to expreſs both, inſtead of applying a proper name to each. In conſequence of the variety of birds, it appears, that they had a generic name comprehending all of them, to which it was not unnatural for them to refer any new animal they met with.

* * * * *

It ſeems to me that there are ſome objections to this theory; *firſt*, becauſe it ſuppoſes every generic noun to have been originally the name of a ſingle object; *ſecondly*, becauſe it ſeems to imply that no noun can be entitled to the character a generic name, which is not applicable to more than a object; and, *finally*, becauſe there is no proof, nor much

much probability in my opinion, that all the objects now diſtinguiſhed by generic names did, in reality, appear in ſucceſſion to the firſt rude cultivators of ſpeech.

THE ſavage who invented the word ANT, or the word BEE, is likely, I conceive, to have ſeen more than a ſingle ANT, or a ſingle BEE; not only becauſe theſe inſects generally ſwarm together in great multitudes, but becauſe their importance to man depends entirely on their numbers, without reference to which, they are too unimportant to have obtained the honor of a name at all. I cannot imagine, for example, that the man who had ſeen only a ſingle LOCUST, would be in any haſte to name an inſect, individually conſidered, ſo inſignificant; but if he chanced to obſerve a BODY OF LOCUSTS, advancing in large and denſe clouds over the face of a great country; extending farther than the eye can reach; obſcuring in their paſſage the rays of the Sun, and marking their progreſs by univerſal deſolation; then, indeed, the inſignificance of the individual would be ſoon loſt in the importance of the community, and Locuſts would obtain the honor of a name.

I AM of opinion, therefore, that the word LOCUST (and ſo alſo of other generic nouns,) was not originally the name of an individual of that community, afterwards applied to other individuals, becauſe of the reſemblance of one to another; and I think, moreover, that the word SUN, though the name only of a ſingle object, is in reality a GENERIC NOUN; (not a PROPER NAME;) in which caſe it cannot be admitted that generic nouns are neceſſarily the names of *more* than one individual object. On the contrary, I take it for granted, that every noun is a Generic name, which preſents to the mind A GENERAL IDEA; though that general idea (as it happens in the caſe of the word SUN,) may not, perhaps, be obſerved to exiſt in more than one individual object. In this caſe, the difference between A GENERIC NOUN and A PROPER NAME, conſiſts merely in th

that the former denotes "a general idea," which may be ſometimes obſerved to exiſt only in a ſingle object, and at other times, in many objects; and that the latter denotes "no general idea" and cannot, therefore, without a *new* act of convention, be applicable to more than a ſingle object.

To explain by example. The word MOON is a generic name, becauſe it preſents to the mind a general idea; yet this general idea was not, until lately, obſerved to exiſt in more than one individual object. The invention of the teleſcope has, however, enabled us to diſcover that JUPITER, for example, has ſeveral Moons; and as the word MOON denotes a general idea, not leſs applicable to the Satellites of JUPITER than it is to the moon which enlightens our Earth; ſo, the term MOON, by its own nature, became applicable to the Satellites of Jupiter, as ſoon as theſe were diſcovered by the teleſcope. In this there was *no new act of convention;* becauſe the word MOON, having no pretenſions to the character of a proper name, is really applicable to as many objects as may be now or hereafter found to coincide with the nature of that general idea which it is formed to denote. The caſe is otherwiſe with the word JOHN, which, being in reality a proper name, preſents no general idea to the mind of the hearer; whence it follows that though many men having the name of JOHN, do undoubtedly exiſt in the world, there is, in the caſe of each individual, *a new act of convention*, by which alone we are authoriſed to call him by the name of JOHN.

IF I were diſpoſed to ſpeculate on the invention of generic nouns and proper names, I ſhould ſay that the former, in all probability, are prior to the latter in the order of time; becauſe it ſeems to me, on reference to the exiſting facts of the caſe, that "the latter have never been reſorted to, until the in-ſufficiency of the former has been firſt aſcertained." We have ...lly proper names for MEN, SHIPS, MOUNTAINS, and RI-

VERS

VERS, becaufe the neceffity is obvious in all thefe cafes; but we have not generally proper names for STONES, TREES, HORSES, LOCUSTS and BEES, becaufe the generic names of fuch objects have been found fufficient for all the ordinary purpofes of Speech. In the cafes of a given HORSE, or a given TREE, that may have been rendered remarkable by circumftances, we may, indeed, be obferved occafionally to have recourfe to the invention of a proper name; but this, I think, tends to confirm the opinion ftated by me; namely, that generic nouns are prior, in the order of time, to proper names; by which they are now fuperceded, not univerfally, but only in certain cafes where the want of proper names would be obvioufly attended with fome inconvenience.

WITH regard to the true import of generic nouns, Philofophers, perhaps, may not be eafily brought to agree; but the favage is not likely to reafon on the nature and character of the words which neceffity alone compels him to invent, though experience and practice will certainly teach him the juft and proper application of all. On this fubject, I fhall merely remark that the fimilarity between two or more objects of the fame fpecies, muft be ftill more ftriking when many are feen at the fame time, than it can be, when each individual is feen in fucceffion; and if we admit, therefore, that this fimilarity is, in the one cafe, the true reafon why all are diftinguifhed by the fame name, it follows, a fortiori, that the fame caufe is likely, in the other cafe, to be followed precifely by the fame effect. The favage who has feen a cloud of locufts at the fame time, is ftill more likely to diftinguifh all by the fame name, than his neighbour who has feen in fucceffion a few individuals of that community. In truth, however, it cannot be admitted that " what conftitutes a fpecies, is merely a NUMBER of objects, bearing a certain degree of refemblance to one another;" for if one man only were left alive in t[illegible] world, the fpecies would continue to exift in that indivi[illegible]

a clear proof that a plurality of individuals is not at all neceſſary to conſtitute a ſpecies.

It only remains to notice the obſervation of Captain Cook, on which, however, I have nothing to ſay. It is at variance with all the ideas which I ſhould have been diſpoſed, a priori, to form on the ſubject; and if there be no miſtake in the facts of the caſe, it ſeems to me to ſet reaſon at defiance. The very extraordinary nature of the ſtatement may, however, warrant a ſuſpicion that Captain Cook was miſled by his ignorance of the Language of thoſe Iſlanders; and Profeſſor Stewart would probably have made the ſame remark, *had his* theory, in this inſtance, led him to oppoſe, rather than to admit the authority of that celebrated navigator. If it were natural in thoſe ſavages to confound the birds of the air and the beasts of the field, we need not deſpair of diſcovering others who ſhall confound both with the finny race; ſince the term Fish includes a variety of ſpecies ſtill more numerous, in all probability, than thoſe included under the term Bird.

TA :— Printed by T. WATLEY,
…ble Company's Press.—1810.

POSTSCRIPT.

I HAD scarcely printed the preceding sheet, when the following paragraph met my eye. It is contained in VOLUME SECOND, PAGE 283, of the translation of ABOO TALIB's TRAVELS, lately published by Major STEWART; and seems to me to corroborate my opinion of the probable priority of GENERIC NOUNS to PROPER NAMES, by the relation of a fact so directly in point, that I cannot resist the temptation to transcribe it.

"THE villages in the desart are so few, and at such a distance from each other, that they do not give them distinct (that is, proper) names:—They are therefore all called *Belaud* (towns.)"

BOOKS.

PRINTED AT THE HONORABLE COMPANY'S PRESS.

VOLUME First of the MUCKAMAUTE HUREEREE; an Arabic Work of celebrity, well known to Oriental Scholars.

IN THE PRESS.

THE Second Volume of the same Work; comprising an Index and Translation into the Persian Language, of all the words contained in the Work. N. B. A part of the MUCKAMAUTE HUREEREE has been published by SCHULTENS, with a Latin Translation, from which European readers may be enabled to form a judgment of the general merits and plan of the Work.

THE First Volume of the SHAH NAMA; collated and corrected for the Press by a body of learned Natives, employed by Government for that purpose at a considerable expence, and placed under the superintendence of the Persian Professor. Twenty-four Manuscript Copies of the SHAH NAMA have been obtained for the purposes of this publication; partly from the library of His Excellency the NABOB VIZIER; and partly from other individuals, eminent in Asia for rank or literature. The Editor is indebted to the liberality of General MALCOLM, for one of the most valuable copies of the Work; which was purchased in Persia, he believes at the price of 1,500 Rupees, having been written in that country about two hundred years ago, and apparently corrected with considerable care. Another copy, obtained by Mr. MONCKTON, boasts of double the antiquity of the former; and several others are more than three hundred years old. The Editor, more anxious for accuracy than rapidity of execution, believes that this great Work cannot be completed in less than six years. It will comprise Eight Volumes of nearly 500 Pages each, (Foolscap size;) and the First Vol[...] will be very shortly issued from the Press.

A Grammar of the Arabic Language, by the author of *the* Persian Grammar now offered to the Public. This Work is intended to comprise all the valuable information bequeathed to their country by the best writers on Arabic Grammar; and will necessarily embrace discussions of such length and difficulty, that the author does not chuse to be responsible for its early appearance.

PRINTED AT THE PERSIAN PRESS.

The Moontukhub ool Loghaut; being a Dictionary of Arabic words, with a Persian Translation; according to the authority of The Kaumoos; The Sehauh; *The Künz*; *The* Moohuzzub; &c.

Four Volumes of Selections for the use of the Students of the Persian Class.

Volume First, comprising a portion of the Akhlauke Moohsunee and the Yoosufo Zuleekha.

Volume Second, comprising a portion of the Goolistaun and Boostaun.

Volume Third, comprising a portion of the Bahaure Daunish and the Deewane Saudee.

Volume Fourth, comprising a portion of the Inshaé Aboolfuzl and the Secunder Nama.

IN THE PRESS.

Volume Fifth, of the same Work, comprising the Akhlauke Jelalee and the Lylee and Mujnoon, of Ameer Khosro.

Calcutta:—Printed by T. Watley, the Hon'ble Company's Press.—1810.